TOM CRONIN
AND
BOB LOEVY
IN THE NEWSPAPERS

2018

INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 2016 two professors of Political Science at Colorado College, Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy, were offered the opportunity to write periodic opinion columns for the local newspaper – the *Colorado Springs Gazette*. This launched a longtime project of the two professors writing for the newspaper for a number of years.

Previously Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy had written together for the *Denver Post*, but only periodically. They also collaborated on a book on government and politics in Colorado.

This book is a collection of the newspaper stories Cronin and Loevy wrote for the *Colorado Springs Gazette* in the year 2018. The dates on the stories are when the columns appeared in the newspaper and on the newspaper's website.

This book offers the opportunity to read the facts, ideas, and opinions of two scholars of Colorado politics all in one place for the calendar year 2018.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Colorado Springs Gazette
1-11-2018

ANOTHER BATTLE OVER PARKS?

By Robert D. Loevy

The proposal to build a sports and event center in Antlers Park behind the Antlers Hotel opens old wounds for neighborhood advocates and park lovers in Colorado Springs.

There is a long history in the city of good government groups, such as the League of Women Voters, fighting hard to fend off attempts to build non-park public facilities – highways, power lines, sports centers, etc. – in any of the parks given to the city by city-founder General William J. Palmer.

That includes not only Antlers Park but also Monument Valley Park, North Cheyenne Canyon Park, and Palmer Park.

The magic words here are "reversionary clause." General Palmer provided in his will that any park lands he gave to the city that were subsequently devoted to non-park uses would revert from the city to Palmer's heirs.

Thus it was that for many years the North End Home Owners' Association, now the Old North End Neighborhood, worked to prevent the City of Colorado Springs from extending W. Fontanero Street across Monument Valley Park and connecting up with W. Fontanero Street on the west side of the city.

The neighborhood association opposed connecting up W. Fontanero Street across the park because of the heavy traffic it would bring to Fontanero Street in the Old North End. Park lovers joined the battle to save the peace and quiet of the park.

Thus the association watched carefully in 1962 as the City approved building an underpass for W. Fontanero Street under the Denver and Rio

Grande Western railroad tracks. This would facilitate extending W. Fontanero Street across Monument Valley Park and connecting it with W. Fontanero Street through the North End.

Then, in 1966, the Old North End criticized an effort by City Councilmember Harold Hawks to get rid of the reversionary clauses in lands given to the City by General Palmer for parks. This was considered a prelude to, once again, having the City extend W. Fontanero Street across Monument Valley Park and over to the west side of the city, a plan the Old North End continued to strongly oppose.

In 1971 the League of Women Voters and the Springs Area Beautiful Association (SPABA) filed suit against the City of Colorado Springs to prevent the City from extending W. Fontanero Street across Monument Valley Park. The suit sought to enforce stipulations in General William Palmer's will that land given by him to the City for parks could only be used for park purposes. The suit sought to settle this contentious issue once and for all.

The case ended in victory for the League of Women Voters and SPABA. The Colorado Springs City Council agreed to a declaratory judgement by the court that the City would not "engage in any activities which will result in sale, disposition of, loss of or diminished use of" the parks in question.

That guaranteed that W. Fontanero Street could never be extended across Monument Valley Park. If such an attempt was made, the land in the park would immediately become the property of the Palmer heirs. In 1971 the heirs were said to be Elsie Queen Nicholson and Evelyn Myers Clarke.

According to the newspapers, Judge Patrick M. Hinton handed down the judgement agreed to by the City. His order said the City should "at all times in the future, act in full compliance with the restrictions and conditions contained in General Palmer's deeds."

Mary Kyer, president of the Colorado Springs chapter of the League of Women Voters, called the City's agreement to the court decision "a great day for Colorado Springs voters." Richard Bradley, a Professor of Physics at

Colorado College and the head of SPABA, said those who brought the suit were "grateful" to Mayor Andrew Marshall and the City Council for "taking this far sighted approach" in accepting the agreement.

Of course all that happened almost a half century ago. Are neighborhood groups and civic organizations ready to battle for the sanctity of General Palmer's park gifts at this later date? Will the League of Women Voters, or the Council of Neighborhoods and Organizations (CONO), or other groups rise up and once again take the city government to court?

Or will efforts to revitalize the downtown economy and take advantage of a $28 million economic development grant from the state to build the sports and events center at long last break General Palmer's will.

The stage is set for a renewal of the Great Parks Battle of 1971, if the neighborhoods and the civic organizations are ready to fight it.

Bob Loevy is a retired political scientist at Colorado College and lives in the Old North End.

Colorado Springs Gazette
1-14-2018

TRUMP NOT INTERESTED IN PRECEDENT

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Donald Trump's presidency was unimaginable until it happened. He scored a surprise victory as an animated outsider cleverly playing on anti-government and anti-establishment sentiments.

Most people, including us, expected the presidency would change Donald Trump more than Donald Trump would change the presidency, but Trump has defied most efforts to change him.

Manafort, Lewandowski, Bannon, Flynn, Priebus, Comey, Spicer, Scaramucci, and even the mysterious Omarosa Marigault Newman tried to change President Trump, but they were cast aside. Fired. Trump insists on being Trump, and other presidents and precedents do not interest him.

Year-One of the Trump presidency has seen a booming economy. He succeeded in pushing through major tax cuts and using executive actions to deregulate in many policy areas. He has nominated dozens of conservatives to the judicial bench and to his Cabinet. He is an activist who dominates the political stage yet has fired up his opponents more than he has rallied his allies.

He drinks nearly a dozen diet cokes a day, watches television news for several hours a day, and has virtually no hobbies except golf. He enjoys being a celebrity, loves to hear applause and take credit, and regularly lashes out at his critics – of which he has many.

His advisers urge him to be "more presidential," yet he prefers to be an impulsive "shoot-from-the-lip" blend of Queens and Broadway swagger rather than a faux imitation of more likeable presidents such as Dwight Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and Ronald Reagan.

Politics is generally understood as involving conversation, collaboration, and compromise, yet the Trumpian approach is more about alpha-male posturing, exaggeration, and threatening law suits. He is who he is, and nobody now expects him to change or be a conventional president.

Trump's stagecraft skills have made him the most central figure in current American political and cultural life. On the other hand, he has become the most divisive and most disapproved first-year president in U.S. history. Even many among his so-called core supporters worry about his erratic and emotionally immature interpersonal relations and the way that they are undermining American statecraft.

Reagan speechwriter Peggy Noonan chastised Trump for his nuclear button tweet: "Blithe carelessness on an issue with such high stakes lowers world respect for American leadership. It undermines our standing as a serious and moral player."

Most presidents work hard to build governing coalitions and expand on the political support that won them election to the White House. Trump, however, seems preoccupied with boasting about how smart, rich, and successful he is. He seems more interested in winning than governing.

President Eisenhower, among others, was fond of saying you could accomplish a great deal if you did not need to take credit for it. Trump has turned that on its head. He is needy, vain, and a relentless credit hog. "Needership" is not the same thing as leadership – a lesson Trump defiantly dismisses.

President Trump has relished bashing the Washington political establishment, the news media, and many of those who serve in the U.S. Government. He disparaged a highly respected U.S. Judge a "so-called Judge." The FBI, the Justice Department, and the intelligence agencies have been regularly berated by Trump, and virtually all the non-Fox news media have been described by Trump as liars and fakers.

Trump's anti-government and anti-politics attitudes won him the Republican Party nomination for president and an upset Electoral College victory. But Trump will need many allies to help the nation deal with

immigration, the environment, complicated trade policies, and rebuilding America's infrastructure.

Rogue loners seldom bring about lasting change. Recall that governors Jesse Ventura of Minnesota and Arnold Swarzenegger of California started out thinking they could rule alone but left with few if any accomplishments.

Effective presidents understand that politics is a process of addition and not subtraction. They transcend political party factions, win new supporters, and try to govern on behalf of the shared aspirations of most Americans.

As for Trump, he boasts that the many unfilled positions at the State Department and the White House, including Science Adviser, are irrelevant. He says: "I'm the only one who counts."

Presidents understand that the United States has an imperfect political system. But Trump goes so far as to describe it as a "rigged" system.

Strangely, Trump blasts those parts of the political system that work for him. He blasted the Republican leadership even though the Republican Party gave him its presidential nomination. He blasted the Electoral College even though, in the end, it put him in the White House without a nationwide electoral majority. He blasted voter regulations in the states, but a special committee appointed by Trump could find virtually no election irregularities, and not the 3 million fraudulent voters he claimed, and was just disbanded.

Most of our recent presidents have had some form of a coherent foreign policy – a Clinton Doctrine, or a (George W.) Bush Doctrine, or an Obama Doctrine. Trump's "America First' notions are a distinctive part of Trump's narrative. But sending more troops to Afghanistan, his threatening gestures toward China in the South China Sea, and his lamentable trashing of the Iran nuclear accord and the Trans-Pacific Partnership have been widely disparaged.

We agree with President Trump that some of the nation's trade agreements need to be reframed. But the United States became great through multilateralism – effective trade agreements and national security alliances. Protectionism, unilateralism and isolationism don't make much sense.

A new and imaginative internationalism is needed now more than ever, but such a revived internationalism is nowhere to be seen in Trump's foreign policy, despite the fact he has some good people, like Mattis and McMaster, advising him at the Department of Defense and on the National Security Council.

How do we grade Trump's first year in the White House? On the positive side the nation has enjoyed peace and prosperity. The controversial and regressive tax reform bill he recently signed into law has some good features. His asking more of NATO allies and Pakistan is appropriate.

But, paradoxically, this has come at the expense of a president who defies the conventional view in America of what a president should be. The vast majority of Americans do not want a president whose all too frequent tweets are: "I'm not a colusionist." "Watch out or I'll sue you!" "I'm the only one who counts."

Political scientists Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy have written several books on the presidency and presidential elections.

Colorado Springs Gazette
2-5-2018

CITY EMBARKS ON UPDATING HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN

By Robert D. Loevy

Colorado Springs is about to undertake a major review of the city's Historic Preservation Plan. This presents the opportunity for the city to turn more of its older residential neighborhoods into National Register Historic Districts and thereby help to preserve and enhance those neighborhoods.

Currently the city has only a few residential National Register Historic Districts. Among them are the Old North End historic district (between Colorado College and Penrose Hospital), the N. Weber Street-N. Wahsatch Avenue historic district (on those two streets from downtown to Steele School), and the Boulder Crescent historic district (Victorian homes west of N. Cascade Avenue and Boulder Street).

Why would neighborhood leaders want to go to the trouble of turning their residential area into a national historic district? The main reason is that it will change the attitude of neighborhood residents toward their homes and encourage them to keep those homes in their original historical appearance.

In addition, national historic district designation helps to protect a neighborhood from commercial zone changes and zone variances. Businesses are less likely to try to enter a residential area when they know the community has been identified as historically significant.

Residents of historic districts can deduct the costs of a major renovation of their home from their state income tax. And, although there are not many, there are people who move to Colorado Springs and ask their realtor to find them a home in a residential national historic district. They want that "historic" atmosphere.

Does National Register Historic District designation mean that the U.S. Government will be telling you whether you can remodel your house and what color to paint it? Despite the rumors, that is not the case. Matching the historical character of your neighbor is purely voluntary when you remodel or repaint in a national historic district. There are no restrictions.

Here is a short list of some of the major neighborhoods in Colorado Springs that would make prime candidates for National Register Historic District designation:

Broadmoor, Skyway, Ivywild, the Mesa, the Westside, the Near North End (north of downtown but south of Colorado College), the Patty Jewett area (west of Patty Jewett golf course), E. Kiowa Street (west of the Deaf and Blind School), E. Platte Avenue (downtown to Union Boulevard), Bonnyville (north of Bonny Park), etc.

How does an older neighborhood qualify for the National Register? The major requirements are that the bulk of the homes be more than 50 years old and that most of the houses are of a specific architectural type (Victorian, ranch-house style, modern, etc.) Note that neighborhoods built in the ten years after World War II are now more than 60 years old and easily meet the age qualification.

History Colorado, the state historical society in Denver, manages applications from neighborhoods to become National Register Historic Districts. The state often has money available to get professional help for researching a neighborhood's history, identifying significant community residents who have lived there, and describing the neighborhood's architectural assets.

If funds are available, the city government should undertake the responsibility of doing an inventory of historic houses in Colorado Springs and thereby identify those neighborhoods (and their boundaries) that qualify for National Register Historic District status. This effort by the city would be particularly helpful to lower income neighborhoods.

Creating more residential National Register Historic Districts is just one of the things the city of Colorado Springs might do as it embarks on

updating its Historic Preservation Plan. The original plan was adopted by City Council 25-years-ago in 1993.

The city should make more of an effort to identify individual homes, business structures, and government facilities that qualify for National Register listing. These historical structures, once identified, should be further protected by city zoning laws.

If these sort of historic preservation issues interest you, or you think your neighborhood might be a candidate for national historic district status, the city of Colorado Springs wants your input. A public meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 6, at the City Auditorium, from 5:30 P.M. to 9 P.M., to begin the process of renewing and improving the city Historic Preservation Plan.

Bob Loevy is a retired professor of political science at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
2-11-2018

COLORADO UNAFFILIATED VOTERS WILL HAVE PRIMARY SAY IN 2018

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

It could be a wild and confusing time in Colorado when the major political party primaries are held this June.

Registered Colorado voters who are unaffiliated with the major (Democratic or Republican) parties or our minor political parties (Vegetarian, American Constitution, Green or Unity) will for the first time, this June, be able to cast their vote in one or the other major party's primary.

This new feature of Colorado's electoral politics is the result of a "popular" state initiative, Proposition 108, which was approved by about 53 percent of those voting on it in the November 2016 general elections.

Leaders of both the Colorado Democratic and Republican parties opposed its passage, but leaders of the Denver business community raised over $5 million to get it on the ballot and campaign for its successful adoption by statewide voters.

Supporters of Prop. 108 promoted it as a "Let Colorado Vote" reform, insisting that over 1 million unaffiliated voters (some call them "independent" voters) were wrongly excluded from having any say in who their governors, state legislators, county commissioners, and members of the U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives would be.

These backers pointed out also that state taxpayers were paying for party primary elections from which one-third of taxpayers – the unaffiliated voter taxpayers – were excluded.

Savvy students of Colorado political parties understood that the main rationale for pushing Prop. 108 was to encourage the two major political

parties to nominate more moderate and presumably pro-business state officeholders.

The idea here was that giving unaffiliated voters a say in selecting major party candidates would weaken the influence of far-right and far-left single interest voters – for example, anti-fracking voters in the Democratic Party primaries and anti-same-sex-marriage voters in the Republican Party primaries.

Unaffiliated voters, according to these assumptions, would be more likely to be more centrist, more moderate, and more likely to help nominate a party nominee who could win in the November general elections.

We will have to wait until the November 2018 general election to see if all of the above political strategy making turns out to be the case.

The major result of the adoption of Prop. 108 is that about 1,180,000 unaffiliated voters in Colorado will be mailed both a Democratic and a Republican primary election ballot in early June.

It will be unlike in the November general election, where a voter can switch back and forth and forth, voting for one party's nominee for one office and a different party's nominee for another office. In the June primary election in Colorado, unaffiliated voters will have to choose one party's full ballot or the other party's full ballot.

Any unaffiliated voter who votes both ballots will be recorded as having cast a "spoiled" ballot and none of the votes will be counted. The Colorado secretary of state and the local county clerks, who are in charge of elections in this state, will be working hard to educate unaffiliated voters about this complicated process.

What will be the biggest impact of Proposition 108 on the 2018 elections in Colorado?

First, it will produce higher turnouts in the June primaries in both major political parties than has previously been the case. We estimate a combined total of 200,000 to 300,000 unaffiliated voters will cast ballots in the statewide Democratic primaries and the statewide Republican primaries.

In Colorado's fifth congressional district, which includes Colorado Springs, there is a hotly contested Republican primary. Both candidates will have to work hard at attracting unaffiliated voters, who may well make the difference in who gets nominated. The stakes are unusually high, because the firth district is heavily Republican and the winner of the primary most likely will in effect be elected to the office.

Denver metro and the populous ski counties on the Western Slope play a major role in who wins statewide Democratic primaries in Colorado. A heavy unaffiliated vote for moderate Democratic candidates for governor in these areas – candidates such as State Senator Michael Johnson and former state Treasurer Cary Kennedy – could give either of those two the Democratic nomination for governor.

Here is the bottom line. It is a new, unprecedented day in Colorado for unaffiliated voters. Many unaffiliated types, who have not been paying close attention to all this political maneuvering, may be surprised in early June when they receive their two official primary ballots – and have to choose on or the other as their temporary party of choice.

Do note that, by voting in either the Democratic or Republican primary, these voters will not lose their status as unaffiliated. Two years from now, in 2020, they once again will get to vote in their choice of the two major party primary elections.

Note also that the major political parties in Colorado will still hold their March caucuses, their county conventions, and their state conventions for the purpose of nominating party candidates directly to the ballot. Only registered party members, registered Democrats and registered Republicans, can attend and vote at these party meetings. Unaffiliated voters can only vote when there is a party primary.

It is exciting that Colorado adopted Prop. 108 and there is a new "y'all come" attitude toward Colorado's major political party primary elections. But keep in mind that none of this has been done before, and there is bound to be confusion over which voters can do what.

It may take several election cycles before it all starts working properly. Stay tuned.

Colorado College political scientists Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are regular commentators on Colorado and national politics.

Colorado Springs Gazette
3-4-2018

TO THINK BIG IN POLITICS, START WITH PRECINCT CAUCUS

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

The race to become Colorado's next governor (along with many other elected offices) swings into high gear on Tuesday, March 6, at 7 P.M. with political party precinct caucuses.

The eventual winner must compete for supporters at five crucial electoral stages – the upcoming neighborhood precinct caucuses, late March county assemblies, an April political party state assembly, a June 26th statewide mail-in political party primary, and ultimately the November 6th statewide general election.

But it all begins with the precinct caucuses. A Democratic precinct caucus and a separate Republican precinct caucus are scheduled in every voting precinct in the state. The dedicated partisans who attend the caucuses are a self-selected political aristocracy. They have a major voice in whom gets elected to political office in Colorado – at all levels – and in the political ideology of those elected officials.

Precinct "caucus goers" come out every two years several months prior to the upcoming November general elections, just as regularly and faithfully as youngsters go trick-or-treating annually at Halloween.

It is easy to qualify to attend a party precinct caucus. All you have to be is a registered voter in the particular political party for 60 days (in Colorado) and 30 days (in your particular precinct).

That is why they are called a "self-selected" aristocracy. Almost everyone in Colorado could register to vote in a political party and go to the local party precinct caucus, if they wanted to – but few bother.

Party caucuses are usually held at a local elementary school, library, or other public gathering place. The most important thing that happens at them is that delegates are elected to the political party's county assembly. In most states they call it a county convention, but in Colorado it is a county assembly.

You can contact the county headquarters of your major political party to find out your precinct number and caucus location.

Serious caucus goers will put their name in to go to the county assembly, because that is where the real power lies.

Some people, however, are content to just go to the precinct caucus and vote for a group of their neighbors to go to the county assembly. They care enough about their political party to go to their neighborhood party caucus for two hours or so on a weeknight, but they feel that is enough to demonstrate their party loyalty and support.

But there is danger in going to a precinct caucus and thinking that is all that will be required of you. In some precincts few people attend the party caucus, and anyone who comes will suddenly be under pressure to be an elected delegate to the party county assembly. The assembly is going to take an evening or a Saturday out of your life.

Other party caucuses are well attended, though, and there can be real competition for who will represent the precinct at the county assembly. There could be multiple candidates, election speeches, and voting to elect the county assembly delegates. In such precincts, it can take years of attending the party caucus to round up the votes needed to go to the county assembly.

So here is the key to understanding the precinct caucuses. They may seem inconsequential, but they are the gateway to the county assembly, where the shape of the fall elections is very much at stake.

In Colorado, the county assembly nominates party candidates for countywide offices such as sheriff, county clerk, county treasurer, and county assessor. The various party candidates give short speeches – and get

supporting speeches from others – and then the assembly delegates vote to nominate their preferred candidate.

Any candidate who gets 30 percent of the assembly vote is automatically on the ballot for the party primary election in June. Note there is a new wrinkle this year. Any candidate who gets 10 to 20 percent of the vote at the county assembly can petition on to the June primary ballot by gathering a specified number of signatures.

But there is more activity at the county assembly. Delegates break up into district assemblies to nominate party candidates for the state House of Representatives and the state Senate in Denver. In addition, county assembly delegates vote to elect the county's delegates to the political party's state assembly, where candidates for statewide offices will be nominated.

What happens at a precinct caucus varies a lot. In some areas, a political party can be so weak that no one shows up to organize and run the precinct caucus. In most places, however, a group of party loyalists will regularly attend the caucus and, if no one else wants to attend the county assembly, will go themselves.

In some cases, representatives of candidates for elected office will come to party precinct caucuses, usually well-attended precinct caucuses, and put in a good word for their candidate before the voting for county assembly begins.

Savvy candidates for elected office have learned how to win with the precinct caucus system. They know that the same people year after year tend to go to precinct caucuses and become delegates to the county assembly. They obtain lists of these "regulars" and contact them – by mail, by telephone, in person – in an effort to get their votes at the county assembly and, perhaps, at the state assembly later on.

Colorado still has at least a dozen candidates seeking the Democratic or the Republican nomination for governor. To date most have been preoccupied with raising funds, obtaining petition signatures, and building paid and volunteer staff.

Now there will be last minute efforts by some of the campaigns to urge supporters to turn out and "Caucus for Stapleton" or "Caucus for Polis." All the campaigns will go into overdrive to win over those who are elected to or dragooned into attending their county assemblies. The next three weeks will be critical.

So, if you are a registered Democrat or a registered Republican, what is the situation at your party precinct caucus? Do many people go, and you will be just one more person there? Or is your caucus lightly attended, and you will find it relatively easy to be elected to the county assembly?

You will have to go to your precinct caucus on March 6 to find out. And if you do go, seriously consider a run for the county assembly.

Colorado College political scientists Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy have attended many Colorado precinct caucuses, county assemblies, and state assemblies. See their book, "Colorado Politics and Policy: Governing a Purple State."

Colorado Springs Gazette
3-21-2018

IN COLORADO, ALL COUNTY ASSEMBLIES ARE NOT CREATED EQUAL

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

The precinct caucuses are in the rearview mirror as Colorado proceeds to its Democratic and Republican county assemblies. In El Paso County (county seat: Colorado Springs), the Republican county assembly is on Saturday March 24 and the Democratic on Saturday March 31.

Most of the media attention at the county assemblies will be on statewide elections, mainly the contested races in both parties for the nomination for state governor. The gubernatorial candidates will visit as many county assemblies in their political party as they can – usually in the more populated counties on the Front Range. The candidates will mingle with the county assembly delegates, give a short, spirited speech, and shake a few hands before racing on to the next stop.

Yet behind the glitter of visiting statewide candidates for office, the county assemblies will go about the less glamourous task of nominating party candidates for county commissioner, county sheriff, county clerk, county treasurer, etc. In El Paso County, two county commissioners and the sheriff are on the 2018 ballot.

To political scientists, however, Democratic and Republican county assemblies are not created equal. The importance of a particular county assembly varies with the extent to which the county is dominated by one political party or the other.

If one political party dominates a particular county, it typically wins all the county offices in the November general election. As a result, that party's county assembly is the only one that matters where county elections

are concerned. The candidates nominated at the assembly, if they also win the party primary election, will de facto be elected to office in the general election the following fall.

In the other party's county assembly, the non-dominant party, the nominations for county offices are meaningless because the candidates nominated, even if they win a primary, will almost always lose the general election.

We've looked at the most recent party registration figures for Colorado as of this February. If a county's percentage of registration among the two major parties was 55 percent or greater in one party, we forecast that county dominated by that particular party. That party was likely, election after election, to win all the elected offices in the county government.

As of now, 36 counties are dominated by the Republican Party, 15 counties dominated by the Democratic Party, and 11 counties capable of swinging back and forth between the two parties. That's right. Only 11 counties in Colorado are likely to see a real general election take place between competing Democratic and Republican candidates for county office.

Among those 11 "competitive" counties are Arapahoe and Jefferson counties in the Denver suburbs; Larimer County in northern Colorado; and two "ski" area counties – Eagle County (Vail) and Routt County (Steamboat).

The counties in which the Democratic county assembly is dominant and the Republican county assembly has little role in the election of county officials include Adams County (59%D), Boulder County (73%D), Pueblo County 62%D), and a group of less populous counties in southern Colorado – Costilla (80%D), Huerfano (61%D), Las Animas (63%D), etc.

If you register as a Republican in any of these Democratic dominant counties, you may have registered away your right to have virtually anything to do with the selection of local county officials – either at the county assembly or in the subsequent primary elections.

While discussing this topic of Democratic dominant counties, it must be noted that none of this applies to Denver, which is a combined city and county. Its city-county officials are elected in non-partisan elections.

In the 36 counties which register heavily Republican, there are almost two dozen rural counties with relatively small populations. Some of these have the highest percentages of Republican registrations in the state: Rio Blanco (90%R), Cheyenne County (85%R), Moffat County (84%R), Elbert County (82%R), etc.

Most of these Republican dominant counties are on the Eastern Plains and the Western Slope, yet there are also Republican dominated counties on the Front Range. The most populous are El Paso County (66%R), Douglas County (69%R), and Weld County (63%R).

Look at El Paso County (Colorado Springs) and we can see how this works out in practice. The Democrats have not elected a county commissioner, a county sheriff, a county clerk, etc., for more than 40 years. Two of the county's five county commissioner seats and the sheriff are up for election in 2018.

In effect, the county's two new commissioners and the sheriff will be selected either at the Republican county assembly (if there is no primary election) or in a Republican primary set up by the county assembly. Registered Democrats will have no role to play in this process.

That's a big deal. There are more than 80,000 registered Democrats in El Paso County, and they are all denied an effective voice in the election of their county commissioners and sheriff. That's a lot of people to be excluded from a supposed popular election process.

Over at the El Paso County Democratic county assembly, it is always difficult to find sacrificial lambs willing to run in a general election in which they are likely to be "smoked." A candidate or two may be willing to get on the Democratic ticket for county commissioner or sheriff in the general election, but typically they will be running for party spirit rather than hoping to serve in office.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
3-27-2018

A LOOK AT THE ROAD MAP TO A HICKENLOOPER PRESIDENCY

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

In April he is scheduled to visit Iowa, where the first presidential election precinct caucuses take place. He has or is holding countless meetings with political experts on national policy and politics. Colorado governor John Hickenlooper is seriously considering a run for president of the United States in 2020.

Hickenlooper has been about as middle of the road as a Colorado governor can get. Although a Democrat, he has worked with both Democrats and Republicans in the state legislature and elsewhere to move his ideas and programs forward. He avoids political controversy whenever possible. He has made a brand of not ruffling other people's political feathers. He is also an adroit booster for Colorado business and tourist interests.

The conciliatory and agreement-building image he has generated as Colorado governor is exactly the image he should use when running for U.S. president.

Public opinion polls tell repeatedly that American voters are fed up with far right Republicans and far left Democrats squabbling with each other and polarizing the nation into political stalemate. There is a growing national mood for a president who can bring the country together, initiate cooperation, and "govern" instead of "wrangle."

Governor Hickenlooper fits this need for a mainstream, pragmatic president perfectly, because that is precisely who he is.

Generally speaking, most outsider candidates for the Democratic nomination for president are counseled to run hard to the left, because the

people most likely to vote in Democratic presidential caucuses and primaries mainly walk down the left side of the political street.

The most recent model for this type of candidate is Vermont Senator Bernie Sanders, whose left liberal campaign for the Democratic nomination for president in 2016 almost defeated the more centrist Hillary Clinton, the eventual Democratic nominee. Hillary Clinton was subsequently narrowly defeated by Republican Donald Trump.

There will be Bernie Sanders spinoffs running for the Democratic nomination in 2020. If the left liberal vote splits between these decidedly progressive candidates, Hickenlooper – running as a centrist moderate – could possibly eke out a plurality in a number of early caucuses and primaries and thereby gain the nomination.

Governor Hickenlooper will have another advantage when running as a cool and entrepreneurial moderate. The current four-year presidency of Republican Donald Trump has been unusually noisy, divisive, and disturbing. Trump is bombastic, erratic, and his methods and his policies scare a large number of Americans.

The quiet, steady, evenly balanced, and productive Colorado governor that we know will stand in sharp contrast to the disruptive Donald Trump. In short, American voters will respond to the promise of a common sense and competent presidency provided by John Hickenlooper following the political mayhem of the Trump years.

Presidential nomination campaigns now begin with a long series of debates on cable and public television, beginning the summer of 2019 and lasting until the Iowa caucuses and the New Hampshire primary in early 2020.

In those early television debates, Hickenlooper should present himself as "A Sensible Pragmatist in the Middle." He should hammer on the point that a cool but persistent moderate such as himself can get much more done that those who go to the far left or the far right and shout for unworkable and expensive reforms.

And what has Hickenlooper's centrist perspective accomplished for Colorado. He can point out that under his quiet and competent leadership the state legislature has passed reasonable budgets every year of his tenure without the stalemates between Democrats and Republicans that have tarnished other states, such as Kansas and Illinois.

And what has been the economic result of running such a tight ship on such an even keel. With Hickenlooper in the governor's chair for the past seven years, the economies of Denver metro and Colorado Springs are booming. People are moving to Colorado, unemployment is extremely low, and the rejuvenation of downtown Denver – symbolized by the renewal of Denver Union Station and vicinity – has been most impressive.

Yes, many other people and governments worked on these achievements. But if they happen in your state while you are governor, you can take credit for them – and Hickenlooper should.

And here is another point. During the Hickenlooper governorship, Colorado made steady progress toward switching from coal and natural gas to solar and wind power for generating electricity. And this has been done so far without major increases in utility bills. This point should particularly add to Hickenlooper's appeal to environmentalists in early presidential primaries and caucuses.

Hickenlooper may be helped in the "First in the Nation" Iowa caucuses because governor and later U.S. Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper (no relation), a Republican, was a mainstay Iowa political leader from 1939 to 1969. The Colorado Hickenlooper will get some votes in the New Hampshire primary because he went to college several years at Wesleyan University in the nearby New England state of Connecticut. Hickenlooper could gain appeal in Nevada's early caucuses because he will likely be the only major Democrat running for president from the West.

A readable campaign biography about Hickenlooper was published two years ago entitled: "The Opposite of Woe: My Life in Beer and Politics." Our review of the book stated: "Hickenlooper comes across in his

biography as in his career as a moderate voter's dream. He is permanently in the middle of the road."

It will not be easy for Hickenlooper running as a Chamber of Commerce Democrat in a left-leaning field of Democratic candidates. But Hickenlooper's charm, quirky self-deprecating sense of humor, and likeableness – and his sharp contrast to Donald Trump's character and political flaws – might make him a presidential winner.

Colorado College political scientists Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy have written more than a dozen books between them on presidents and presidential elections.

Colorado Springs Gazette
4-1-2018

REFLECTIONS ON MLK JR.
50 YEARS AFTER DEATH

By Robert D. Loevy

The life of Martin Luther King, Jr., and my life touched personally only for an evening. The year was 1964, and I was in Washington, D.C., working as a legislative aide in the office of Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, a Republican from California.

Senator Kuchel (pronounced Kee-cull) was the Republican whip in the Senate. More importantly, he was the Republican floor leader for the bill that would become the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the landmark legislation that ended racial discrimination in businesses that served the public in the United States.

Martin Luther King, Jr., was much in my mind in 1964 as I went about my daily chores of answering the senator's mail on civil rights and attending strategy sessions with my fellow Republican and Democratic Senate staffers. It was King, after all, whose non-violent demonstrations in Birmingham, Alabama, in the spring of 1963 had inspired the introduction and strong support for the 1964 civil rights bill in Congress.

It was exciting when Senator Kuchel offered me his ticket to the 1964 annual dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The Senator had to be in California that evening, drumming up support for the civil rights bill in his home state.

For a Washington, D.C., event, the dinner was relatively small in terms of attendance. Only about 100 people were present. It was held in a relatively small but very ornate hotel banquet room. There were two guests of honor. One was the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., the acknowledged

leader of the Civil Rights Movement. The other was Willy Brandt, the mayor of West Berlin in Germany, who was famous for his confrontational style in dealing with the Soviet Union during the Cold War.

Because of the relatively small size of the gathering, I could see Martin Luther King, Jr., perfectly. He gave a short address after dinner, so I heard first-hand the distinctive speaking style and some of the inspirational words for which he was so renowned. I was spending my daytime hours working to advance the civil rights bill that Martin Luther King's efforts had done so much to inspire and expedite. It was truly gratifying to attend a public event with him there in person and giving a speech.

And so it was that I was deeply affected four years later – on April 4, 1968 – when Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated by a rifle shot while standing on the balcony of the Lorraine Motel in Memphis, Tennessee. As chance would have it, I was away from my hometown of Baltimore, Maryland, that evening, giving a speech in Greenwich, Connecticut, on the upcoming 1968 presidential election.

Sadly, King's death at the hands of an assassin had resulted in public demonstrations by African-Americans and others in major cities on the East Coast and in the Midwest. Although many demonstrations were non-violent, some turned to rioting and looting. Baltimore was no exception to this situation, and eventually conditions in my home city got so out-of-control that President Lyndon Johnson had to send in regular U.S. Army troops to restore order and safety.

I returned from Connecticut to Baltimore by passenger train and got off the train in a city under military rule. The streets were empty except for soldiers posted at every intersection and the occasional military truck, loaded with rifle bearing soldiers, racing down the street. My home was in the close-in suburbs, just over the city line, so luckily I was driving away from the danger area rather than towards it. I passed heavily fortified military roadblocks, but the soldiers were stopping people driving into the city, not out of it. I was relieved when I arrived home safely.

How ironic, I thought, that the death of Martin Luther King, Jr., known for his firm belief in non-violence, should result in violence requiring temporary military rule in a supposedly free country.

But elsewhere there was a much different reaction to the shooting death of Martin Luther King, Jr. As word spread through the U.S. Capitol building in Washington, D.C., the political forces that had united to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 swung into action once more. A bill was introduced that banned housing discrimination in the United States. Once again liberal Northern Democrats and conservative Midwest Republicans joined together to pass major civil rights legislation.

It was a lasting tribute. The Housing Rights Act of 1968 was adopted in memory of Martin Luther King, Jr. In death as in life, he inspired lasting legislative reform to American civil rights.

Bob Loevy is a political scientist at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
4-29-2018

TIME TO REFORM COLORADO'S POLITICAL PARTY NOMINATING PROCESS

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

It is time to reform the political party nominating process in Colorado. The double-barreled system currently in use – which involves both a political party state assembly and candidates petitioning on to the ballot – is complicated and confusing for the average voter to understand.

Also petitioning on the ballot favors rich and well-financed candidates over those with less money to spend.

The weird mix-up in Walker Stapleton's campaign for the Republican nomination for governor was one illustration of the problem. Stapleton originally planned to petition on to the Republican primary ballot, but problems with dubious petition signatures forced him at the last minute to go to the Republican State Assembly in Boulder on April 14.

Luckily for Stapleton, he won 44 percent of the delegate votes at the Coors Events Center at the University of Colorado, which was more than 30 percent and thus enough to qualify him for the June primary ballot. A second candidate, former Parker Mayor Greg Lopez, received 33 percent and also made the GOP primary ballot.

In a more recent snafu, six-term (12 years) U.S. Rep. Doug Lamborn was knocked off the Republican primary ballot because some of his petition signatures were not solicited by properly qualified petition gatherers. The Colorado Supreme Court, in a unanimous vote, invalidated enough signatures to drive Lamborn's signature count below the required 1,000.

Lamborn, whose 5th Congressional District includes Colorado Springs and vicinity, is appealing the state court decision to federal court. If he loses

there, he will be unable to run in the Republican primary in June and his career in Congress likely will be over.

Really? A 12-year incumbent U.S. Rep. is pushed off the Republican primary ballot by a court rather than the voters?

With all the above flaws, it is probably time to reform the entire political party nominating system in this state.

State assemblies in Colorado function to vet and rank candidates for major statewide offices. The candidate getting the most delegate votes is listed first on the June party primary ballot. The candidate receiving the second highest number of delegate votes is listed second, and so on down the line.

Candidates hope to get "top line" designation on the primary ballot at the state assembly, and the political lore is that "top line" will win them more votes in the party primary. This happens, but not always.

State assemblies also were designed to eliminate marginal candidates from cluttering up the party primary ballot. A candidate is required to receive 30 percent, or more, of the delegate votes at the assembly to get on the ballot. Tally less than 30 percent, and your candidacy is all but over. Get 10 to 29 percent of the vote and you can start a late campaign to petition on to the ballot, a very difficult process. Got all that.

But it is also possible in Colorado to bypass the state assembly from the beginning by gathering petition signatures. About 10,500 are required to petition on to the ballot for governor. Petition on, and a candidate does not need delegate votes at the assembly at all. What is needed, however, is $200,000 to $300,000 to pay the petition gatherers. Independently wealthy former state Rep. Victor Mitchell successfully petitioned on to the Republican ballot for governor in the June primary.

There are real advantages to petitioning on to the ballot rather than going through the state assembly process. First, there is no worrying about not making the 30 percent cut off. As the number of candidates running at the state assembly for a particular office increases, the likelihood is that only

two or possibly three could get the 30 percent required to qualify for the primary ballot.

Do the math. Once three candidates have 30 percent, an unlikely split anyway, it is not mathematically possible for any more candidates to get on the primary ballot via the state assembly, or in Lamborn's case, via a congressional district assembly.

That is what happened to current Attorney General Cynthia Coffman at the Republican State Assembly. She received only 5 percent of the votes (30 percent needed) and thus failed to be nominated to the primary ballot. She is out of the race for the Republican nomination for governor completely.

Candidates who petition on to the ballot customarily pay professional organizations to gather signatures for them, thereby buying their way in to the primary election. Petitioning on is thus particularly attractive to candidates who are either personally wealthy or are successful money raisers. They have plenty of money to pay people to gather signatures for them.

It is our contention that the relatively low cost (for a wealthy or well-funded candidate) of petitioning on to the ballot may be attracting wealthy people to run for political office in Colorado. This has been particularly true since the courts have ruled that petition gatherers can be paid and do not have to be volunteers.

When major candidates for statewide office, such as governor and U.S. senator, petition on to the ballot, the state assembly loses much of its significance. What good is the ranking process – getting top line – if many of the major candidates are not in the running at the state assembly but are petitioning on instead.

The Democratic State Assembly, also held April 14, was at the 1st Bank Center arena in Broomfield. Cary Kennedy, a former state treasurer, won 62 percent of the delegate vote and took "top line." In second place was U.S. Representative Jared Polis, who won 33 percent of the vote (30 percent needed) and also qualified for the Democratic primary ballot. But two other

candidates, former state Senator Mike Johnston, and current Lieutenant Governor Donna Lynn, petitioned on to the Democratic primary ballot for governor and were not voted on at the Democratic state assembly at all.

Sadly, getting on the Republican or Democratic primary ballot for governor or U.S. senator by petitioning on now seems like a sold commodity in Colorado. Private firms hire professional petition gatherers and promise to get virtually anyone on the primary ballot *for a price*. And buying your way on the primary ballot is a more certain method than taking your chances with that 30 percent rule at the state assembly.

The state assemblies are still critically important for designating candidates for other state offices, such as state treasurer, state attorney general, and state secretary of state. There is much less petitioning on for these lower offices.

The nominating process in Colorado has become needlessly complex. It has evolved into a mish-mash of the state assembly and the petition process that is difficult for everyone to comprehend.

We recommend that next year's session of the state legislature consider the following reforms in January 2019:

1. Eliminate petitioning on to the ballot. It overly advantages the rich and well-financed to run and, by default, excludes thoughtful and less well-heeled candidates.
2. Lower the requirement to be nominated at the state assembly from 30 percent to 15 percent. That will allow more candidates with modest financing to get on the party primary ballot.
3. Because more candidates will now be running on the party primary ballot, have a runoff election between the top two finishers.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
5-6-2018

WILL A BLUE WAVE HIT COLORADO IN '18?

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

The national news media have been reporting lately on the "blue wave" that is expected to roll across the United States on Election Day this November.

"Blue" stands for Democratic. "Wave" stands for a potential torrent of anti-Trump votes that will bring the Democrats control of both houses of Congress and win the party many other elected offices throughout the United States.

There is justification for talking in the spring about a blue wave swamping the Republicans in the general election this fall. In the first place, the political party that wins the White House in the previous presidential election (2016) almost always suffers congressional losses in the non-presidential election two years later (2018).

In other words, even if Donald Trump was a popular president scoring well in the public opinion polls, the Republican Party would be expected to lose seats in the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate this fall.

But Donald Trump, so far in his presidency, has approval ratings routinely below 40 percent. It is those low approval ratings – plus the normal drop in support for the president's political party two years after the presidential election – that are driving the blue wave predictions.

Adding to blue wave speculation in 2018 are demonstrations for higher pay by public school teachers, Trump's anti DACA stands, the #me too movement, and pressure for gun safety.

In addition to big losses in Congress, the GOP could also drop a few governorships and relinquish control of several houses of the various state legislatures around the country.

If history repeats, the supposed 2018 blue wave will reach Colorado and damage the Republicans when it gets here. Twice in relatively recent electoral history, in 1964 and 1974, blue waves have struck Colorado, put additional Democrats in elected office, and left the Republicans in an electoral shambles.

In 1964 Colorado, a state that had voted Republican in the previous three presidential elections, went strongly for Democrat Lyndon Johnson over Republican Barry Goldwater. Goldwater's outspoken brand of conservatism, which included voting against the Civil Rights Act of 1964, did not play well in Colorado.

The rout was so complete that even the three strongest Republican counties in Colorado – El Paso, Douglas, and Weld – voted for Lyndon Johnson.

In the 1964 blue wave the Colorado state House of Representatives, at that time routinely Republican, elected a Democratic majority. The state Senate, however, remained Republican

An even bigger blue wave struck Colorado in 1974, the year that national anger over the Watergate scandal was in play. The cover up of a Republican engineered robbery of Democratic offices at the Watergate complex in Washington, D.C., forced Republican President Richard Nixon to resign from office.

This blue wave elected a Democratic governor in Colorado (Richard Lamm) and switched a U.S. Senate seat from Republican (Peter Dominick) to Democratic (Gary Hart). Democrat Tim Wirth upset the incumbent Republican that year in Colorado's 2nd congressional district. And, as in 1964, the Democrats won control of the usually Republican Colorado House of Representatives yet failed to win the state Senate.

The electoral damage to the Republicans in the blue waves of 1964 and 1974 was reduced by the fact that Colorado was a much more

Republican state at that time than is the case now. Colorado currently is more evenly balanced between the two major political parties. A formerly red (Republican) state is now rightly regarded as a purple (swing) state.

Buoying Democratic prospects from the anticipated blue wave of 2018 is that, with the two parties now so evenly balanced in Colorado, a surge of Democratic votes in Colorado should produce more Democratic victories than the blue waves of the past.

The morning after this plausible blue wave surges through, Colorado may have a Democratic governor (perhaps its first woman governor in Cary Kennedy), a Democratic state treasurer, and a Democratic attorney general. These elected posts are usually held by Republicans.

A super blue wave in 2018 will be required to dislodge Wayne Williams, of El Paso County, from his job as secretary of state. Williams is a savvy Republican incumbent and should survive the blue wave if any Republican can, yet he has a feisty Democratic opponent in attorney Jena Griswold, a native of Estes Park.

As the blue wave waters recede, the Democrats could find themselves with comfortable majorities in both the Colorado Senate and House. With a Democratic governor elected as well, the Democrats will control the two houses of the legislature and the governor's office, thereby having an uncommon political control over Colorado state government.

Treasured Democratic goals such as more state money for K-12 education and free tuition at community colleges could be achieved.

And a blue wave, if it appears, just might give the Democrats the two U.S. House of Representatives seats held by Republicans Mike Coffman (6th district) and Scott Tipton (3rd district). Coffman faces a tough challenger in Democrat Jason Crow. The Democrats would then hold 4 or possibly 5 of Colorado's 7 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives.

A cautionary note. If the U.S. economy and employment numbers continue to be strong, it will help the Republicans this November. If Trump's impressive early negotiations with the two Koreas continue to be successful, this could further blunt the blue wave.

And anticipated waves sometimes do not materialize. There was supposed to be a red wave in the 1998 off-year elections because of Democrat Bill Clinton's "misbehavior" with a White House intern. The Republicans made some gains that year, but there was no wave effect.

But the possible blue wave will affect the upcoming 2018 elections in Colorado. Democrats will work harder as they anticipate a big win. Republicans, particularly incumbents, will make maximum efforts to keep their elected offices. It should make for a hard fought, heavily financed, and exciting election.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
5-13-2018

MOST GUBERNATORIAL CANDIDATES HAVE A HISTORICAL PERSONA

By Robert D. Loevy

There is a persona – a set of common characteristics – for Colorado governors. They have all been males (although a woman came close), have almost all held a major elective office before becoming governor, and have mainly been from the Denver metropolitan area.

With the start of mail-in voting in Colorado's 2018 Democratic and Republican gubernatorial primary elections just one month away (early June), now is a good time to review the last sixty years of Colorado governors and see how the crop of 2018 candidates in both political parties compares to them.

Start with Steve McNichols, a Democrat who was elected Colorado governor 62 years ago in November of 1956. A native of Denver, he was an activist Democrat and a successful reformer. Among other things, he strengthened state planning, expanded the state highway system, and established the University of Colorado Medical Center in Denver.

McNichols had previously served as lieutenant governor. That is good news for Donna Lynne, the current lieutenant governor, a Democrat, who hopes to repeat in 2018 McNichol's feat of rising from #2 to #1 in the governor's office.

Steve McNichols was succeeded in the governor's chair by John Love, a Republican from Colorado Springs. Love was governor during the turbulent 1960s. He is credited with keeping the state on an even keel during the urban unrest, minority demonstrations, and student protests that characterized that era.

Love had never been in elected office before. His only political experience was running for chairman of the El Paso County (Colorado Springs area)
Republican Party, an election he lost by one vote.

Love's example should gladden the political heart of Doug Robinson, a businessman and nephew of George Romney. He is running for the Republican nomination and, like Love, has never held an elected office.

John Love resigned as governor in the early 1970s to take a job in the Nixon Administration in Washington, D.C. He was replaced by Lt. Governor John Vanderhoof, from Glenwood Springs on the Western Slope, who ran to be elected governor in his own right but was defeated.

Democrat Richard Lamm beat Vanderhoof in 1974 and was governor for three four-year terms. An outspoken environmentalist, Lamm called for limiting Colorado's population and thereby preserving Colorado's natural beauty. He appointed the first woman and the first Hispanic to the Colorado Supreme Court.

Prior to being elected governor, Lamm served as a state representative from Denver. That sets a precedent in 2018 for former state Rep. Victor Mitchell, a Republican, and former state Sen. Mike Johnston, a Democrat, to rise to the governor's office from the state legislature.

Lamm was succeeded in 1986 by Roy Romer, another Democrat, who also served three four-year terms. Romer was an activist who provided state government support for three projects in Denver that benefitted the entire state – the Denver Convention Center, Denver International Airport (DIA), and bringing in major-league baseball (the National League Colorado Rockies).

When Roy Romer was elected governor, he was completing two terms of service as Colorado treasurer, a statewide elected office. His name had been before the state electorate twice as candidate for treasurer, in 1978 and 1982, and he won both times.

Two candidates in 2018 will find cause for celebrating the Romer "former state treasurer" example. Republican Walker Stapleton , who is

currently completing two terms as state treasurer, and Democrat Cary Kennedy, who was elected state treasurer in 2006. Kennedy was defeated for reelection as state treasurer by Stapleton in 2010.

In 1998 Romer was replaced as governor by Bill Owens, a Republican. Owens almost did not make it to the governor's office. He only narrowly defeated Gail Schoettler, the woman who was the Democratic candidate.

Owens was famous for T-REX, the widening of I-25 from the Denver Tech Center to downtown Denver to five traffic lanes in each direction. It earned him the nickname "Ten-Lane Bill." He also was credited with championing Referendum C, a timeout for state government from the strict financial limitations of TABOR, the Taxpayers' Bill of Rights.

Owens preceded his election to the governorship by, like Romer, being elected to and serving as state treasurer. That is even more points in 2018 for Republican Walker Stapleton and Democrat Cary Kennedy, both of whom have service as state treasurer in their political backgrounds.

And now Bill Ritter, the Democrat elected governor in 2006 to follow Bill Owens. Ritter had great plans for advancing environmental protection and K-12 education in Colorado, but the 2008-2010 economic recession reduced tax income to state government and left Ritter cutting the budget rather than increasing state spending.

Ritter rose to the governorship from an important but not statewide local office in Colorado – Denver district attorney. That makes him a successful role model for Republican Greg Lopez, the former mayor of Parker, who also is seeking to move up to the governorship from a local rather than a statewide office.

Lopez also can look for inspiration to current Democratic Governor John Hickenlooper, who served two terms as mayor of Denver.

The most unusual 2018 candidate for governor, historically speaking, is Democrat Jared Polis, who is hoping to move into the governor's mansion after serving in the U.S. House of Representatives from Colorado's 2nd congressional district (Boulder County and environs).

In the past 60 years, no member of Congress has been elected Colorado governor. Polis will set a 60-year precedent if he is elected governor next November.

The situation is nice. All the candidates running in the Republican and Democratic primaries for governor in 2018 can find a previous governor with an electoral persona similar to their own.

Based on historical gubernatorial persona alone, the 2018 candidates rank this way. Republicans: Stapleton, Mitchell, Lopez, and Robinson. Democrats: Kennedy, Lynne, Johnston, and Polis.

Obviously, this gubernatorial persona analysis places a strong emphasis on who has previous electoral experience and service in office – particularly statewide office.

Bob Loevy is a political scientist at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
5-17-2018

QUESTIONS FOR NEXT COLORADO GOVERNOR

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

The 2018 Colorado governor's race thus far has been a sleepy affair. The eight candidates (four for the Democratic nomination and four for the Republican) have mainly made news as they struggled to get a place on their party's primary ballot, either by selection at a state assembly or petitioning on to the ballot. And some of them have attracted attention with their prodigious fundraising.

In brief, the bulk of what has been written about the candidates to this point has been about the mechanics of the election process rather than where the candidates stand on state issues.

It astonishes us how little the public has been told about those who would be our next governor. The better financed candidates have advertisements on local TV news, but these early ads are typical fluff pieces or out-of-date wheezes about abolishing Obamacare in Colorado.

Three things are notable about this year's race for Colorado governor. First, there are more major candidates running than anyone can remember. Second, there are an unusual number of wealthy candidates on the ballot, in both parties, who are helping to finance their own campaigns. Thirdly, unaffiliated voters as well as Democrats and Republicans will be sent mail-in primary ballots in early June. Election Day is June 26.

The *Gazette* and the El Pomar Foundation are sponsoring a major debate this Saturday between all the candidates of both major parties. And there will be subsequent debates elsewhere – the more the better. Here, based on our four decades of watching Colorado politics and writing two books on our state's political parties and policies, are a number of questions

we hope debate audience members – particularly the moderates – will ask of the potential nominees for Colorado governor:

1. How do you conceive of the Colorado governorship as a leadership office? How will you keep citizens informed, and how will you go about educating Coloradans about the major challenges facing our state? What will your "gubernatorial style" be?
2. Former governor Bill Owens (a Republican) once noted "that Coloradans have a long history of liking their governor yet not following their governor's lead on issues." Will you work to overcome this problem by being a strong persuader and agreement-builder on necessary but controversial state programs?
3. In what ways would you be different from our current two-term popular – yet allegedly easy-going – Governor John Hickenlooper?
4. Both former governors Richard Lamm (a Democrat) and Bill Owens told us that "the hardest but most necessary thing to do in politics is to be able to say 'no' to your friends." Owens added that "you sometimes have to go against your base – because some things are good for the state but not for you politically." Can you share with us a situation or issue on which you might be guided by their counsel?
5. Some of Colorado's recent governors have not been able to work well with the state legislature. How would you work effectively with state legislators of each party?
6. Former governors of Colorado say it is easy to become isolated and arrogant in the Governor's Mansion. "Arrogance" said former Governor Roy Romer (a Democrat) "is what does us in… The Achilles' heel of most people in power is arrogance." How would you avoid becoming arrogant, narcissistic, and isolated?
7. Hyper-partisanship is not as bad in Colorado as it is in Washington, D.C., but is growing in our state. What will you do to encourage the type of bipartisanship, decency, and civility that

U.S. Senator John McCain (R., Ariz.) has urged the nation to develop?

8. What will you do to provide for more gun safety and for protecting underage populations from the negative effects of marijuana?
9. What new ideas do you have to protect and preserve Colorado's precious water resources?
10. What solution do you favor for improving Colorado's worn out and overcrowded highways? In order to really solve this problem, what taxes would you raise (state income, state sales, or state gasoline taxes)?
11. What will you do to gradually upgrade Colorado's public university system from the bottom quartile to the top quartile? Will you work to lower tuition at public universities and try to free the graduates from the damaging effects of higher education debt?
12. What would you do to restructure Colorado's complicated fiscal and budgetary requirements?
13. Do you plan to cooperate with the policies of U.S. President Donald Trump or will you oppose the president when you judge his programs are not in Colorado's best interest?
14. Recent Colorado governors have become divorced in office. One retired after just one four-year term in office. A few governors have said they did not enjoy living in Colorado's sprawling old Governor's Mansion. Are you certain you are emotionally prepared for the pressures of this office and all the grief that comes along with some glory?
15. And exactly why do you want to be governor of Colorado?

We understand that many of the candidates will try to evade answering these questions. Most candidates get elected by dealing in vague generalities rather than specific proposals. But these are the questions they should be answering so we voters can assess the character and quality of their candidacies.

Colorado College political scientists Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are the coauthors of "Colorado Politics and Policy: Governing a Purple State."

Colorado Springs Gazette
5-27-2018

SPRINGS LAYS GROUNDWORK FOR "DOWNTOWN AT MIDTOWN"

By Robert D. Loevy

It reads like a dream. City planners are working to turn three blocks of N. Nevada Ave., from the bridge over the old Rock Island railroad tracks to E. Fillmore Street, into a highly urbanized area of chic stores and top-quality restaurants.

The stores and restaurants will line both sides of N. Nevada close to the sidewalk and roadway, while above and behind the stores and restaurants will be high density housing in the form of apartments and townhomes.

"City Council adopted the master plan for the project in March," said principal planner Mike Schultz. "Now we are about to hire a consultant to start filling in the details."

If this project sounds a bit like Larimer Square, LoDo, or particularly RiNo in Denver, then that is exactly what is intended. The South Zone of an adopted plan called Renew North Nevada Avenue will cater to sophisticated new residents of all income levels who will be able to walk to shopping and eating and thus will be less dependent on automobiles.

High-density residential uses in the area will increase from 9 percent of the activity to 21 percent.

Mass-transit will be part of this "downtown at midtown." A transit stop at Fillmore and Nevada will allow residents to catch buses (or maybe someday light rail vehicles that look like old street cars) to other parts of the city, including Colorado Springs downtown, Colorado College, the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS), etc.

And bicycles will get favorable treatment. Bike lanes will be added in both directions to N. Nevada Ave., and an east-west bike lane will be painted on to Polk Street that will head west and take bicyclists to Monument Creek and its major north-south bike trail.

Presently this section of N. Nevada Ave. and surroundings is characterized by low density business developments that cater to the automobile, such as a used car lot and auto supply stores. But existing uses like Murphy's Tavern and the Navaho Hogan will fit right in to this new "walkable" urban environment, as will the former Lincoln Elementary school with its craft brewery, café, and other small scale retail establishments.

The highly urbanized atmosphere will mainly be created on N. Nevada Avenue south of E. Fillmore Street by building new structures right up to the sidewalk and the curb. No grassy lawns or front-of-the-store parking lots as found in suburbia. Front doors of the businesses will open onto the sidewalk and street. And the stores will be urged to have plate-glass windows for passing pedestrians to look in and see samples of the merchandise for sale.

Parallel parking will be provided along both sides of N. Nevada Avenue so outlanders can drive in, park, become pedestrians, and begin enjoying this brand new citified environment with its active "street life."

Creating from scratch a downtown-style environment is not all that is revolutionary about this plan. Conventional zoning with specific uses, such as residential, commercial, and industrial, will be set aside.

A new overlay zone will sit atop the regular zoning and provide for a variety of "mixed-uses" within the area. To guarantee the new development fits into the high-density downtown atmosphere desired, city planners will approve all the development projects in the overlay zone on the basis of their appearance and the quality of materials used.

As with conventional zoning, planners' decisions can be appealed to the Planning Commission and thence to City Council.

This more-or-less free style of zoning, called "form based zoning," will stand in sharp contrast with the way things are done in the neighborhood immediately to the south – the Old North End – just across the N. Nevada Avenue bridge over the old Rock Island railroad tracks.

For sixty years the Old North End has worked to preserve its historic Victorian character by strenuously resisting all commercial or multi-family intrusions into its mainly single-family residential zoning.

How will this high-density, mixed-use development be paid for? According to principal planner Schultz, some city funds will be available to install the curb-and-gutter and the sidewalks that will be the key to the highly urbanized atmosphere. But the cost of the apartment buildings, the shops and stores, and the restaurants will all be provided by private investors.

The economic success of similar projects in other cities in Colorado and the United States holds out hope that private financing for this project will work.

So far this N. Nevada Avenue at E. Fillmore Street project does not have a name. It needs one. One idea might be to combine Fillmore and Nevada into "Fillvada." Another would be to call it "North Nevada Town." Schultz said he hopes a name for the project will develop "naturally" as work progresses.

City Council approved this adventurous high-density and high-activity project and adopted the multi-use overlay zone at the same time. It awaits only private investment to be turned into reality.

The exact boundaries of the South Zone of Renew North Nevada are: N. Cascade Ave. on the west, Commerce St. on the north, Stone Ave. on the east, and the old Rock Island railroad tracks (now Union Pacific) and the Rock Island Trail right-of-way on the south.

Bob Loevy is a political scientist at Colorado College. Read about the plan at https://coloradosprings.gov/renewnnave.

Colorado Springs Gazette
6-3-2018

FUNERAL TRAIN SYMBOLIZED LOW POINT IN U.S. HISTORY

By Robert D. Loevy

U.S. Senator Robert F. Kennedy was assassinated by gunfire 50 years ago on June 5, 1968. He had just won the 1968 Democratic presidential primary election in California when he was shot with a pistol by Sirhan Sirhan, a Palestinian disgruntled over Kennedy's support for Israel.

Three days later, on June 8, 1968, Robert Kennedy's funeral was held at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City. Kennedy had represented the state of New York in the Senate. Following the funeral, Kennedy's casket was placed on a railroad passenger train to be transported to Washington, D.C., where he was to be buried at Arlington Cemetery in nearby Virginia.

The major television networks, which had provided live coverage of the funeral, then began televising the Robert Kennedy funeral train as it began rolling through New Jersey on its way down the Northeast Corridor to the nation's capital.

Unexpectedly, and spontaneously, thousands of people along the rail route decided to leave their homes and make a pilgrimage to the railroad tracks to personally watch the Robert Kennedy funeral train go by.

It took me about three seconds to decide I was going to join them.

This mass movement of mourners to trackside took both the Kennedy family and the Penn Central railroad by surprise. Tragedy compounded tragedy when another train going in the opposite direction accidentally killed two of the funeral train observers.

The railroad promptly stopped every passenger train on the railroad between New York and Washington, no matter what direction the trains

were going in, until the funeral train reached its destination in Washington, D.C.

I decided to witness the Robert Kennedy funeral train in a small out-of-the-way rural location rather than in a big city such as my hometown of Baltimore. The television was revealing giant crowds massing at the major train stations along the Northeast Corridor, such as Trenton and Philadelphia. I chose not to fight the big city crowds.

I drove to Edgewood, a lightly populated community along the rail line between Baltimore and Wilmington, Delaware. The small train station there had attracted a crowd of about 100 persons. The group was quiet and solemn. I found a spot on the station platform with a perfect view of the train tracks.

After a short wait, two large electric locomotives with no train behind them rumbled through Edgewood at about 30 to 40 miles-per-hour. The word was quickly passed among the group of watchers that this was a pilot train sent a few minutes ahead of the funeral train to make certain the tracks were clear of obstacles.

And then the funeral train came rolling by. Because of the crowds of onlookers along the railroad, the train was only going about 30 miles-per-hour. It was long, perhaps as many as 20 passenger cars. I could see through the windows of the train that almost every seat was occupied.

It was a tribute to the Kennedy family and their political influence, I thought, that an entire train load of people wanted to accompany Robert Kennedy's casket from the funeral in New York to burial in northern Virginia.

And then the biggest surprise of the day. The last car of the passenger train was an "observation" car with an open platform at the back end of it. And sitting on the open platform for all to see was Robert Kennedy's younger brother – Edward M. (Ted) Kennedy.

It must have been a difficult situation for Ted Kennedy to handle. Because of the solemnity of the situation, he could not wave enthusiastically with hands high in the air to the many persons gathered to honor his slain

brother as the funeral train slowly went by. But some acknowledgement had to be made of the crowd's presence. Ted Kennedy therefore had his right hand down at his side, about where his belt was, waving very slowly back and forth.

It was a perfect gesture for the moment. The quietly waving hand seemed to say "I see you" and "I appreciate that you came here to share with me your sorrow over the terrible loss of my brother." As the train passed on down the railroad, that image of Ted Kennedy slowly waving his hand was the final thing that everyone gathered at the train tracks saw.

I have never gotten that image out of my mind. This was one of the lowest moments in United States history. The year 1968 had begun in January with the Tet Offensive, a vicious attack on American forces in South Vietnam that indicated the Vietnam War would not soon be over. Then in March, President Lyndon Johnson withdrew from running for reelection to the White House because the Vietnam War was so bitterly dividing the Democratic Party. Next, in early April, came the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., the hero of the Civil Rights Movement.

With the killing of Robert Kennedy, only one question seemed to remain. How much pain could our nation stand?

The Robert Kennedy funeral train went on to Washington, D.C. Because of slowing down for the crowds that came to see it, a normally four-hour train trip required eight hours. The burial at Arlington Cemetery was held in the dark.

I believe that almost all of those who saw the Robert Kennedy funeral train, now fifty years in the past, found it a moving experience. I certainly did.

Bob Loevy is a political scientist at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
6-9-2018

VOTING IN COLORADO'S MAIL-IN ELECTIONS HAS BECOME AN EXTENDED AFFAIR

By Robert D. Loevy

Ballots for the Democratic and Republican primary elections were mailed this first week in June, so by now almost all voters registered in a political party in Colorado should have their ballots in hand.

Some dedicated political activists will mark their ballots and mail them in almost the moment they received them. Others will put the blank ballots aside to be voted later, perhaps after getting more information about the candidates. And there are a number who will put their blank ballots aside and never quite get around to mailing them in or putting them in a ballot deposit box.

The process ends on Election Day on Tuesday, June 26. This period should be called "Voting Time," because with mail-in voting and early voting well-established, voting takes place over three weeks or so mainly in voters' homes and not on one day in polling places.

And that presents problems for the people who run for political office and their campaign staffs. Back in the good old days, when almost all the votes were cast on a single Election Day, candidates and their campaign managers would "peak" their campaigns the weekend before Election Day.

They would take most of their campaign money and spend it on television ads or newspaper ads that final weekend. Campaign volunteers would be sent out to leave flyers touting the candidate on people's doorsteps. Other volunteers would "wave corners" that weekend and right on up to Election Day, holding up signs with the candidate's name and yelling at passing motorists to be certain to vote for their guy or gal.

But now voting is spaced out over almost a month. It is a cooler process. On any given day a certain number of voters are marking and mailing their ballots. Campaign ads have to be running on television and glossy mailers have to be arriving in the mail throughout this extended period of time. By the weekend before Election Day – the old peak – a significant percentage of the votes have already been cast.

If you are wondering why so much money is being spent on election campaigns in Colorado lately, one of the reasons is that campaign ads and mailers have to be purchased for three weeks or so rather than only over a long weekend.

And the media used in election campaigns have changed greatly over the last 30 years. Back in the mid-20th Century, the vast majority of Americans watched three major television networks and their local affiliates. Most campaigns would mainly buy time over the peak weekend on one of the three local TV stations, especially the local news programs. "Raise all the money you can and spend it all on television" was the standard campaign advice of the time.

But now there are many competing ways to reach voters. There is over-the-air television, cable television, pop-up ads on the internet, and spreading information about the candidate on social media. There is more variety and complexity than before. Well-financed campaigns now have to hire experts in each of these varied communications fields if they want to get their message to as many voters as possible.

In the old days, if you wanted to know a candidate's positions on the issues, you stopped by the campaign headquarters and picked up "position papers." These were long written discussions on where the candidate stood on the major political issues of the time and place.

Today, however, all competitive candidates have websites that voters can check to learn the facts of their political careers and their positions on issues. Unlike the detailed and well-reasoned position papers of old, however, most campaign websites tend to emphasize photographs, short videos, and simple slogans about the candidate.

And now there is "family voting." When ballots are mailed to all the adults in a family living in the same home, there is the temptation to gather around the kitchen table – or in the living room – and mark up the mail-in ballots together. No more having to vote by yourself in the privacy of a voting booth and needing to remember how someone else suggested you vote. Husbands and wives, and parents and adult children, can now put their heads together and produce a collective response in the form of their mail-in ballots.

So much for the secret ballot, at least as far as the family is concerned.

A big change to voting in Colorado is new this year. Unaffiliated voters have been mailed ballots for both the Democratic and the Republican primary. Unaffiliated voters, for the first time in state history, can mark up and mail in *one or the other* of the two party primary election ballots.

This can be said about Colorado. Our state has been very adventurous about trying new ways of voting.

It should be kept in mind that the main benefit of mail-in ballots has been an increase in voter participation. The at-home ease and convenience of mail-in ballots has brought many more participants into the electoral process.

So, if you were mailed a ballot for the primary elections, be certain to mark it and mail it.

Bob Loevy is a political scientist at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
6-17-2018

UNAFFILIATED VOTERS IMPROVING THEIR POWER, INFLUENCE

By Robert D. Loevy

This is a peak moment for Colorado's unaffiliated voters. In the past seven years, they have come from a position of neglect to being one of the most powerful voting groups in the Colorado electorate. Things have really been going their way.

Right now, with Election Day only a few days away (June 26th), unaffiliated Coloradans are, for the first time in the state's history, filling out primary election mail-in ballots in either the Democratic or Republican parties. But that is only one part of their recent rise in power.

Other gains by unaffiliated voters include increased influence over the 2011 state Reapportionment Commission, thus getting for themselves more power in the election of state Senators and state Representatives. Also unaffiliateds have slowly replaced both the Democrats and the Republicans in having the largest number of state voting registrants. And, if state legislative redistricting and congressional redistricting reform are adopted by the voters this November, unaffiliated voters will have a constitutionally mandated role in all future state redistricting.

Let's start with the 2011 state Reapportionment Commission, which drew the boundary lines for state Senate districts and state House of Representatives districts following the 2010 U.S. Census. Previously either the Republicans or the Democrats controlled the commission, and the dominant political party gerrymandered the district lines to favor the election of their candidates.

In 2011, however, an unaffiliated voter, Mario Carrera, was appointed to the Reapportionment Commission and held the swing vote between the Republicans and the Democrats. Carrera, who served as chair of the commission, pressed the other commissioners to create more "competitive" state Senate and state House districts.

A competitive seat is one in which the two political parties are evenly balanced and either the Republican or the Democrat can win the election.

If more legislative seats were competitive, Carrera reasoned, unaffiliated voters casting their ballots in the general election would play a meaningful role in which candidate was elected. Carrera objected to the fact that in "safe" Democratic or "safe" Republican seats, the winning candidate was chosen in the party primary elections where, at that time, unaffiliateds were ineligible to vote.

Next look at recent changes in state registration to vote. Fourteen years ago, in 2004, the Democrats constituted 30.4 percent of Colorado registered voters. Right now, in May of 2018, the Democrats are at 31.5 percent, a slight gain of 1.1 points.

The Republicans in 2004 were at 37.2 percent, well ahead of the Democrats. By May of 2018, the Republican percentage had dropped precipitously to 31 percent, a loss of 6.2 points.

While the Republicans were going down, unaffiliated voters were shooting upwards. Having only 32.4 percent of registered voters in 2004, the unaffiliateds were in first place, well ahead of both political parties, in May 2018 with 37.4 percent, a gain of 5 points.

The increased polarization of the two major political parties in Colorado in recent decades has hurt the Republicans more than the Democrats. The Republican form of polarization – opposing abortion, being against same-sex marriage, etc. – has caused the Republicans to lost registrants to the unaffiliateds. The Democratic form of polarization – big spending on social reform, raising taxes on the rich, etc. – does not seem to be antagonizing new registrants as much as the Republican form does.

This trend of the Republican Party losing registrants to the unaffiliateds has been very steady over the past 14 years in Colorado. It can be expected to continue. Unaffiliateds may soon constitute 40 percent or more of registered voters in this state.

And even more power for unaffiliated voters lies ahead. The state legislature placed on the November 2018 general election ballot two proposals – one to reform the drawing of district lines for both houses of the state legislature and the other to reform the drawing of district lines for Colorado's members of the U.S. House of Representatives.

In both proposals, unaffiliated voters are given a major role in drawing the district lines. The hope is that the presence of unaffiliateds will prevent one or the other of the major political parties, the Democrats or the Republicans, from gerrymandering the districts in their favor.

Back in November of 2016, Colorado citizens voted to give unaffiliateds a vote in political party primary elections, a process that is taking place right now. With that in mind, there is reason to expect that, this coming November, Colorado voters will give unaffiliated voters a major role in drawing state legislative and congressional district lines.

Unaffiliated voters should hold a parade and a rally to celebrate their new and expanding political powers. But they cannot do that. As unaffiliateds, they are by nature political non-joiners. There is no party organization or party machinery. They will just have to feel good individually.

Bob Loevy is a political scientist at Colorado College. He was a member of the 2010 Colorado Reapportionment Commission.

Colorado Springs Gazette
6-26-2018

POLARIZATION RIGHT HERE IN 5TH CD RACE

By Robert D. Loevy

If you want a good example of why United States politics has become so highly polarized between the Democrats and the Republicans in recent years, it is available right now right here in Colorado in the Fifth Congressional District.

U.S. Representative Doug Lamborn, a Republican, has occupied the Fifth Congressional District seat in Congress since 2006. Although considered one of the most conservative members of the U.S. House of Representatives, he is being attacked in the current Republican primary for not being conservative enough.

The Fifth Congressional District is mainly comprised of the city of Colorado Springs and environs. The mail-in primary election will conclude and the votes will be counted this Tuesday June 26.

The Fifth has been gerrymandered into a heavily Republican seat, so heavily that no Democrat has ever come close to winning the seat in a general election. The result is the incumbent Republican in this "safe seat" can only be defeated in the Republican primary.

Logic would suggest that any member of Congress as conservative as Lamborn would be challenged for re-nomination in the primary election by a candidate with moderate middle-of-the-road values, or even slightly liberal values, but that is not the way these things work these days.

Lamborn's major opponent for the Republican nomination, state Senator Owen Hill, has attempted to position himself to the right of Lamborn. In a recent mailing from Owen Hill for Congress, Representative Lamborn was characterized as a "counterfeit conservative." After a number

of other charges designed to make Lamborn look like a moderate or even a liberal, the mailing urged GOP primary voters to "send a REAL conservative Republican to Congress."

When it comes to polarization of the political parties, the point is the effect of Owen Hill's actions on Representative Lamborn. If the threat to Lamborn's re-nomination comes from the far right rather than the center or the left, the effect is to pressure Lamborn to be as conservative as he can possibly be when voting in the U.S. House of Representatives.

That rules out Lamborn searching for compromise solutions with the Democrats. Any such actions would provide campaign fodder for future Republican primary challengers similar to Owen Hill. And that is the basic cause of the polarization between Democrats and Republicans that has led to partisan stalemate in Congress.

Note that the same situation exists, although in the opposite direction, in seats that are as heavily Democratic as the Fifth Congressional District is Republican.

Democratic incumbents in such safe-seats do not fear losing the general election to a Republican. They fear losing the Democratic primary to a rival who runs as hard to the left as possible. To protect against that happening, Democratic incumbents become as doctrinaire liberal as Republican Representative Lamborn is doctrinaire conservative.

When one realizes there are many safe Republican seats in the U.S. House of Representatives which, similar to the Colorado Fifth, are pressured to the hard right, one begins to understand why the House is so polarized. And of course there are many safe Democratic seats throughout the nation where the pressure is to the left, thus completing the polarization picture.

Political scientists lament this situation of partisan polarization and stalemate, but there is nothing that can be done about it in a democracy. In heavily Democratic and heavily Republican congressional seats, persons must be free to run in Democratic and Republican primary elections, challenging incumbents as they do so. The right to run for office, and that

means the right to run in political party primary elections, is one of the required features of a functioning democracy.

One possible solution to the polarization problem would be to try to reduce the number of safe Republican and safe Democratic seats in the U.S. House that are so subject to this polarizing pressure. If more congressional seats were "competitive," capable of being won by either the Democrats or the Republicans in the general election, candidates would be forced to be more moderate and compromising in order to be elected. The sharp partisan polarization would be reduced.

Colorado citizens will get the opportunity to consider such a reform in the general election this November. The state legislature has sent a ballot question to the voters that, if adopted, would reduce the ability of the major political parties to "gerrymander" safe Republican and safe Democratic seats.

In the meantime, observe the last few days of the electoral struggle between incumbent Representative Lamborn and challenger Owen Hill as each tries to convince the voters that he is more conservative. Therein is displayed a major cause of polarization and stalemate in our national government.

Bob Loevy is a political scientist at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
7-8-2018

GOVERNOR'S RACE FORECAST: HOTLY CONTESTED, LIKELY NASTY

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

November 6, 2018, will be national presidential mid-term Election Day, and it will also be the day Coloradans elect their next governor. Who will replace John Hickenlooper, our current governor? He serves another six months until early January.

Democrats have held the governor's office for 36 years – or nine terms – in the last 56 years. Republicans have held it only 20 years – five terms. There have been more Democrats than Republicans going all the way back to the state's founding in 1876.

This year's race for governor promises to be just as competitive as it was four years ago when former U.S. Representative Bob Beauprez came within three percentage points of beating incumbent Governor John Hickenlooper.

State Treasurer Walker Stapleton handily defeated three lesser known Republicans in the June 26 party primaries. He did so even though he was heavily outspent by outsider businessman Victor Mitchell. Stapleton won even as his campaign stumbled a few times, especially when it was discovered that the firm he hired to collect petition signatures was alleged to have improperly gathered signatures.

Stapleton pivoted quickly and successfully to win delegate endorsement at the Republican Party state convention, but it was a near miss and hurt his political reputation.

Stapleton is a moderately conservative Republican and a relative of the two George Bush presidents. He has been a low visibility statewide

official (treasurer) for the past eight years. He is known as a fiscal conservative and a champion of putting the state's public employee pension system on a more sound financial footing.

Stapleton and his advisers are well aware this year's November election will be a referendum on the Donald Trump presidency. But it will also be about vital Colorado state policies and which candidate is best qualified to provide state leadership.

Those are big challenges for Stapleton. First, Trump is currently unpopular, more so in Colorado than most other states. Trump has trouble winning support from educated independent suburbanites, and they are the crucial swing vote in Colorado's electorate.

Stapleton has downplayed his stands on conservative social issues and seems resigned rather than antagonistic to Colorado's legalized recreational marijuana. But his conservative base in the Republican Party may push him to be harder right on social issues, a problem that harmed previous Republican statewide candidates Dan Maes and Ken Buck. Stapleton needs to run as a moderate if he is to win his way into the Governor's Mansion on November 6th.

Stapleton is handicapped in another way as well. He cannot run against Democrat John Hickenlooper's gubernatorial leadership of Colorado. The state's economy is one of the best in the nation and unemployment at a historic low. Hickenlooper may be quirky but he is personable and popular and provides Stapleton little or no target to attack.

Stapleton's biggest advantage will be that his Democratic opponent will be portrayed as too liberal for Colorado.

U.S. Representative Jared Polis won an impressive victory over three well qualified rivals in the Democratic primary. Most people, including us, were surprised by his 20 percentage point win over former state Treasurer Cary Kennedy. She was a veteran policy adviser at both the state capitol and in Denver City Hall. She was the favorite of activist Democrats Party regulars at last March's local precinct caucuses and at the party's April State Assembly.

She ran as a champion of public education, yet she was running against Jared Polis and former state Senator Mike Johnston, both of whom rightly had a record as educators dedicated to improving education.

The Democrats were mainly in agreement on most issues. They were left of center progressives, but they avoided being tagged as far left wing Bernie Sanders Democrats. In fact, all of them had supported Hillary Clinton for president in 2016 and Barack Obama before that.

What explains the Polis victory? First, he has served as the 2nd District congressman the ten past years. Before that he was an elected member of the Colorado State Board of Education. He is also very wealthy. He helped found several start-up technology companies.

Polis donated at least $11 million to his campaign for governor. Thus he had more television ads, more internet ads, more mailings, and more paid campaign workers. This was just too much for the attractive and qualified Kennedy and Johnston to overcome. Money does not always win elections, but it assuredly played a major role in Polis's big win.

Here are a few other things about the recent primary election. About 100,000 more people voted in the Democratic primary rather than the Republican, even though both political parties share about the same percentage of state registered voters. More women, maybe more than 100,000, voted than men. And many more unaffiliated voters chose to vote in the Democratic rather than the Republican primary.

Republican Stapleton will have to run a better campaign in the general election than he did in the primary. He will have to satisfy the Tom Tancredo-Trump Coloradans as well as the traditional pro-trade and anti-tariff business community. He will have to attract suburban women. He will have to hope for some mistakes and gaffes in the Polis campaign that he can take advantage of.

Democrat Polis will have to assure Colorado voters that he is not "too Boulder" for the rest of the state. Even though he was not in the Bernie Sanders camp, he can be assured of that group's vote in November. What he

needs to do is to get the type of business community support that Hickenlooper and former Governor Roy Romer regularly received.

Polis has actually had greater success as a businessman than Hickenlooper and Romer have had, but he needs to convince potential voters that his business and congressional skills will make him a better governor than Stapleton.

Polis also has to work hard to unify his party. Popular former U.S. Senator Ken Salazar endorsed and campaigned for Cary Kennedy in the primary. Former Governor Richard Lamm and former U.S. Senator Gary Hart backed Mike Johnston. Teachers unions supported Cary Kennedy.

Three cheers for all those who ran for governor in 2018. There were more than a dozen men and women in the race at one point. It takes stamina and courage to run. Coloradans should be grateful that so many talented people were willing to take the time and raise the money to run.

Buckle up. The 2018 governor race in Colorado is likely to be hotly contested, highly partisan, and record-setting expensive.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
7-15-2018

PLANCOS FORESEES A MORE URBAN, MIXED-USE FUTURE

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

New development in Colorado Springs might take the form of mixed-use neighborhoods that bring residences, retail businesses, office buildings, and entertainment facilities together into highly walkable areas that are less dependent on the automobile.

And these new multi-use neighborhoods could be connected to the rest of the city by sidewalks, walkways, trails, bike lanes, bike trails, and multi-modal transit (buses and light rail). Also close by – walkable and bike accessible – should be schools, parks, and recreation facilities.

That's the basic vision put forth in PlanCOS, an aspirational city planning prescription for Colorado Springs proposed under the Mayor Suthers administration by the city Planning Department.

PlanCOS is currently undergoing a round of public hearings. Many ideas are under discussion, but mixed-use development is getting most of the attention.

Mixed-use contrasts with the way most urban development has taken place in Colorado Springs ever since it began growing rapidly after World War II. Large housing developments with strict residential zoning are served by somewhat distant large shopping centers. An automobile is the required transportation device in such a "single-use" zoned world.

PlanCOS, which is what our City Hall calls it, makes the case that the proposed multi-use neighborhoods shall be more "environmental" and "sustainable," two words that appear frequently in the document. There will, according to the plan, be an emphasis on "higher density" housing, more

"diversity" in housing styles and housing costs, and provision for "attainable housing" for lower-income citizens.

Apartments, town houses, as well as a few single-family homes will make up this new "inclusive" urban residential mix. People will be encouraged to build outbuildings on the large lots surrounding single family homes, thereby increasing housing supply. And "small homes" that occupy very little ground will be welcome, along with "urban farms and gardens."

There could be an emphasis on "vertical development" – stacking residences and offices and shopping in a single structure so that residents can get most of the services they need in the high-rise building they live in.

There is an emphasis in PlanCOS on creating street life. Large grass-filled front yards should shrink so that houses and apartments are closer to the street. In the same way, retail businesses should be built right out to the sidewalk line. Large parking lots in front of businesses will be eliminated so pedestrians can walk right into a small shop or restaurant.

A rationale is provided for emphasizing this new high-density and socially-interconnected form of urban development. The former two-parents plus children family, which was perfect for single-family housing in giant housing developments, is in decline. There now are more one-person families (widows and widowers) and unmarried-couple families and empty-nest families that do not need single-family homes on large lots with shopping and other services miles away. PlanCOS notes:

"Over the next 20 years, the average size of households is not expected to increase but our household types will continue to diversify. This includes an increase in demand for more urban and walkable neighborhoods and housing options."

PlanCOS divides Colorado Springs neighborhoods into four main groups and gives different prescriptions for each group:

1. Established Neighborhoods. These are the older neighborhoods, most of them clustered around downtown. PlanCOS lists three of them as historically significant – the Westside, Colorado City, and

the Old North End. Recommendations include traffic-calming on major streets, encouraging older neighborhoods to apply to become national historic districts, and, most of all, helping neighborhoods develop neighborhood master plans to provide them with more park facilities, bike lanes and bike trails, etc. PlanCos specifically mentions Knob Hill, Ivywild, and Patty Jewett as neighborhoods ripe for this sort of urban upgrading.

2. Changing Neighborhoods. These are neighborhoods that need attention from city government. They are characterized by unused small shopping centers and big-box stores. PlanCOS recommends that the declining shopping centers and stores be repurposed as high-density attainable housing. In addition, "infill" projects on vacant ground are suggested that will bring better housing and perhaps office buildings to the area. Southeast Colorado Springs, Valley Hi, Park Hill, and Southwest downtown are examples of this type of neighborhood.
3. Emerging Neighborhoods. These are the newer neighborhoods in the city, many of them concentrated in northeast Colorado Springs in the Powers Boulevard area. They are the kinds of suburban neighborhoods where many Colorado Springs citizens live. PlanCOS describes them this way: "These neighborhoods with recently completed construction are assumed relatively stable and less vulnerable to near-term and mid-term change." The plan recommends more walking trails and bike trails/bike lanes for these successful neighborhoods.
4. Future Neighborhoods. This is where the new emphasis on high-density mixed-use neighborhoods might have its greatest impact. Private developers would present master plans to the city that embody the guiding principles of PlanCOS. In other cases, Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning will allow city planners to judge and approve the proper mixture of uses. No place in Colorado Springs has yet been built to these new standards. The plan

recommends a visit to the Stapleton neighborhood in Denver (built on land from the old airport) to see high-density mixed-use in successful action.

There is much more to PlanCOS than what is covered in our short summary above. Go to one of the neighborhood meetings on PlanCOS to learn about it for yourself and hear what your neighbors have to say. There doubtless will be dozens of differing reactions to these ideas – yet they deserve discussion, debate, and reflective consideration on the future of Colorado Springs.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
7-20-2018

"SWING VOTERS" KEY TO 2018 COLORADO GOVERNOR'S RACE

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

A swing voter is a voter campaign strategists covet, especially in closely contested elections. These are the voters who can potentially go to either of the two major party candidates for office. In some elections the swingers vote Democratic, but in others they vote Republican.

Back in 2014, two close Colorado statewide elections were held on the same Election Day. Over 2 million people voted. Incumbent Democratic Governor John Hickenlooper won one of those elections and was rewarded with four more years in the Governor's Office. He defeated former U.S. Representative Bob Beauprez, a Republican, by a margin of 68,238 votes. That same day, on the same ballot, incumbent Democrat Mark Udall lost his seat to in the U.S. Senate to U.S. Representative Cory Gardner, a Republican, by 39,688 votes.

About 19,000 more voters voted in the governor race than in the U.S. Senate election on November 4, 2014. Still, a significant number of Coloradans split their ballots between the two parties. The result was the Democrats retained the governorship yet lost the U.S. Senate seat to the Republican challenger – all on the same day.

Who are the swing voters? They are harder to describe than you would think, in part because they vary from election to election. It is safe, however, to describe Colorado swing voters as mainly unaffiliated voters who are not especially pleased with the two major parties. They are likely moderate in their political philosophy and skeptical about politicians. It is

believed they make up their minds on whom to vote for later in the campaign than traditional party voters do.

Swing voters experience "cross-pressure." Their religious views against abortion may attract them to a Republican candidate, but at the same time they might like the character and experience of the Democratic candidate. Or their union membership pulls them one way but their passion for hunting leads them to be strong Second Amendment (pro-gun) advocates.

Here in Colorado the party primaries are over and the nominees for governor are decided – U.S. Representative Jared Polis for the Democrats and state Treasurer Walker Stapleton for the Republicans. With general election day a little more than three months away on November 6th, (and mail ballots being mailed out two to three weeks earlier), this is the time when campaign managers examine swing voters in an effort to figure out how to contact them and earn their votes.

Polis and Stapleton have two major challenges over the next three months. They must unite and inspire high turnouts from their partisan base and, secondly, court and convert the swingers (leaners, floaters, and potential defectors from the opposition party).

Do certain counties in Colorado have more swing voters than others? We looked at the 2014 election, and some of the results were surprising.

Start with Denver, the state capital. It is regarded as one of the most Democratic areas in Colorado. But Denver had more swing voters in 2014 than any other county in the state. Our study calculated that as many as 15,000 voters who voted for Democrat Hickenlooper in the governor election in Denver swung to Republican Cory Gardner in the U.S. Senate election. Republican Cory Gardner can thank Denver for nearly about 15 percent of the swing voters that made possible his election to the U.S. Senate.

This is a warning to Republican candidates for statewide office not to write off Denver from their campaigns just because Denver votes so strongly

Democratic. Cory Gardner showed in 2014 that, under the right conditions, swing votes to the Republicans in Denver can be gathered by the thousands.

Our interest here is the marginal swing that occurred in 2014 in Colorado's 64 counties. Our calculation of the county marginal metric is arrived at by combining Hickenlooper's vote advantage over his fellow Democrat, Mark Udall, and U.S. Senate candidate Cory Gardner's vote improvements over his fellow Republican, Bob Beauprez.

Thus, in rounded numbers, Hickenlooper succeeded in attracting about 9,000 more votes than Udall in Denver County. Cory Gardner bested his fellow Republican Beauprez by around 6,000 votes. That makes for a spread or swing of about 15,000 votes in Denver at that election. That is a bit technical, yet we hope you are still with us.

The two next biggest counties with swing votes were not a surprise. Both Jefferson and Arapahoe counties, the western and southern suburbs of Denver, have long been regarded as populous counties that swing readily from one political party to the other. Jefferson County came in just below Denver with about 14,900 swing voters in 2014. Arapahoe County was close behind Jefferson with about 14,600.

Incidentally, both Jefferson and Arapahoe counties, along with Denver, voted for the loser in the U.S. Senate race – Mark Udall. This illustrates the non-obvious fact that who wins a particular county is not as important as how the swing vote is shifting in that county.

Somewhat surprising was Douglas County, a southern suburb of Denver with Castle Rock as its county seat. It is one of the strongest Republican counties in the state, and we thought there would be little swing voting there. That was not the case. The Douglas County swing vote from Democratic to Republican in the two elections was nearly 12,000, the fourth highest county swing-vote in the state.

Another surprise was Mesa County (Grand Junction) on the Western Slope. It ranked fifth on the swing-vote list at about 8,500. That is a lot of swing voters for a county with a relatively small population.

Now look at the other extreme – populous counties with low numbers of swing voters. Denver metro's Boulder County, with its legendary support for Democrats, shifted barely at all. Its swing number was merely about 1,000. Another populous county, Adams County, the north and northeastern suburbs of Denver, clocked in with about 3,700 swing votes. Pueblo County on the southern Front Range and a Democratic stronghold, had only 2,500 swing voters.

The Colorado Springs metropolitan area also was a low scorer on swing voting. El Paso County had only about 6,000 swing votes, a low number in view of it being one of the most populous counties in Colorado. Teller County (Cripple Creek), with only about 50 swing votes, was near the bottom of the list.

Based on ours and related studies, we estimate there may be 100,000 to 150,000 potential swing voters among the likely 2 million Coloradans who will vote this November.

Seeking to identify and get swing voters to turn out and vote for your candidate is a popular campaign technique. It is an exacting challenge, especially for underfunded candidates who need to make every dollar count.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
7-29-2018

PARSING ELECTORAL MAP WITH GOVERNOR'S RACE UNDERWAY

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

With two prominent candidates running for governor – Jared Polis for the Democrats and Walker Stapleton for the Republicans – Colorado is about to turn into an electoral battlefield. This is the time, at the start of this three-month political conflict ending on general Election Day November 6, to walk around that electoral battlefield, surveying the strong and weak locations of the contesting political parties.

The Democratic Fortress. Denver and Boulder are the two obvious centers of Democratic voting strength in Colorado. Legions of Democrats in these two counties will produce a three-to-one massive vote for Democrat Jared Polis. There will be a mini-battle in Denver as Democratic activists work hard to prevent even minor voter shifts to the Republicans in Colorado's capital city (it has happened).

The Twin Forts of the Republicans. But the Republicans have strong points of their own to directly counter the Denver-Boulder Democratic Fortress. One fort is a combination of El Paso County (county seat: Colorado Springs) and Douglas County (Castle Rock). These two adjoining counties, located to the south of Denver, are the largest single encampment of Republicans in the state. And they will be getting reinforcements from a second fort – Weld County (Greeley) northeast of Denver.

These three counties are the most populated and strongest Republican counties. Collectively, they are a match for the Democrats' Denver-Boulder fortress. Walker Stapleton and the Republicans will be harvesting every

voter they can find in El Paso, Douglas, and Weld counties – and they will predictably get nearly two-thirds of the votes in these GOP friendly regions.

The Democrats' Ski Country Mountain Divisions. The skiing counties on the Western Slope are supportive of Democratic candidates. Routt County (Steamboat Springs), Summit County (Breckenridge), Eagle County (Vail), Pitkin County (Aspen), Gunnison County (Crested Butte), and San Miguel County (Telluride) are the key Democratic battalions here. None of these ski counties are populous, yet taken together they make a solid contribution to the Democratic Party's statewide effort. The well-educated and well-to-do people who live year round in the ski counties, along with the youthful resort workers, have shown a decided preference in recent years to side with the Democrats.

The Democrats' Fading Southern Outpost. In addition to the ski counties, the Democrats have had a small number of counties near the border with New Mexico that have a heritage of voting for Democrats. These counties are low in population, but taken together they have tipping point leverage for the Democrats and could make the difference in a close statewide election. These counties, which have significant numbers of Hispanic voters, have weakened in their loyalty to the Democratic Party in recent years. They are Alamosa (Alamosa), Conejos (Conejos), Costilla (San Luis), and Saguache (Saguache) counties.

The Republicans' Prairie Grass and Pine Forest Divisions. The most decentralized and spread out forces in the Colorado political skirmishes are in the rural counties of Colorado both east and west of the heavily populated Front Range. From Logan County (Sterling) in northeast Colorado to Baca County (Springfield) in the southeast to Montezuma County (Cortez) in the southwest and Moffat County (Craig) in the northwest – and many counties in between – the Republicans have solid support in 34 low-population counties. The most populous of these counties is Mesa County (Grand Junction). These counties produce outsized majorities for the Republicans on Election Day. There are more votes out on the Eastern

Plains of Colorado and in the forested mountains of the non-skiing Western Slope than one might suspect. The Republicans should not neglect them.

The Battleground Counties. Exactly as there are battleground states in national elections, there are battleground counties in Colorado – counties where either party can win the vote and the winner of the election is likely determined. Pueblo County (Pueblo), once considered strongly Democratic, is now a battleground county. Larimer County (Fort Collins), previously a Republican leaning county, occasionally shifts from one side to the other.

But the three biggest battleground counties in Colorado are all in the Denver metropolitan area. Jefferson County (Golden), Arapahoe County (Littleton), and Adams County (Brighton) have large populations that can swing from one party to the other. They are similar to the No Man's Land between the opposing military armies of World War I. They are squeezed between the Democratic Denver-Boulder fortress on the one hand and the Republican powerhouses of El Paso, Douglas, and Weld counties on the other. Both parties will contest fiercely for Jefferson, Arapahoe, and Adams counties.

That's a brief look at Colorado's geopolitical landscape in 2018. Keep in mind, however, that Republican, Democratic, and unaffiliated voters live in every county. There are Republicans such as Neil Gorsuch, recently appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court, who came from heavily Democratic Boulder County. And there are Democrats like former Lieutenant Governor Joe Garcia, who resided in strongly Republican El Paso County. But Colorado's political parties have their strongholds and weak points, and astute political observers should be aware of them.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
8-6-2018

TRUMP GRADES OUT WELL

By Robert D. Loevy

For many years, political scientists have used "Role Theory." This is the idea that major political offices should be analyzed in terms of the "role" that their occupants – U.S. senators, state governors, U.S. presidents, etc. – have played while holding the office. After the roles of each office were clearly defined, political scientists then would evaluate the holders of those political offices as to whether they were playing the "role" correctly.

Donald Trump has been president of the United States for more than 18 months. How well has President Trump played the "role" of president according to the standards set by political scientists? The president is said by "role theorists" to play ten major roles in American political life. Let's look at all ten and see how Donald Trump is doing.

1. **Chief of State.** The president is the top official of the U.S. Government, both in domestic affairs and international relations. He is, in short, the personification of the United States. Donald Trump, however, projects an image of self-importance and free-wheeling command that disturbs large numbers of people, both at home and abroad. On the other hand, he is drawing attention to neglected problems of unequal international trade relations and rogue nations with nuclear weapons (North Korea and Iran). Grade: C+.

2. **Chief Executive.** The president commands both the appointed officials and the hired hands that constitute the bureaucracy of the U.S. Government. Trump has neglected this role, leaving many important appointed jobs unfilled and at times launching verbal attacks against some of the people who work for him in government agencies. He also seems mainly

bent on undoing the executive orders of his predecessor – President Barack Obama – rather than building a strong executive record of his own. His biggest mistake to date – separating immigrant parents from their children at the Mexican border – occurred in this role. C-.

3. **Chief Diplomat.** The president is primarily responsible for U.S. foreign policy and relations with other states. Trump has a mixed record here. His constant talk of "America First" suggests he is turning his back on the major role the United States has played since the end of World War II as a strong supporter of world peace. His criticisms of America's major treaties with other nations – such as the NATO mutual defense agreement with Europe – are particularly disturbing. On the other hand, his first 18 months in office have been generally peaceful. C+.

4. **Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.** President Trump has played this role well. The military men he has put in charge at the Pentagon are generally admired. His prompt bombing of Syrian air bases after the Syrian government dropped gas bombs on rebel cities received strong praise. And, continuing Barack Obama's low key approach to destroying the Islamic State in the Middle East, Trump has scored a largely unappreciated victory over ISIS. Also note his strong support for military spending. A.

5. **Chief Legislator.** The concept of separation of powers calls for Congress and the president to be separate, but presidents are expected to have a legislative program and get it passed. President Trump got off to a bad start, being unable to get the Congress to "replace or repeal" Barack Obama's signature health care program – Obama Care. But the passage of a major tax cut (including big cuts in corporate tax rates) has given Trump a major bump up in his legislative score. A-.

6. **Chief of Political Party.** By custom, the president is the leader of his political party. President Trump has pursued policies and made statements that have made some members of his own Republican Party uncomfortable. Particularly in terms of toning down America's role in the world, Trump has turned his back on the previous internationalist character of the Republican Party establishment. He appears to have written off the

upper middle class voters that have traditionally been the base of the GOP and is working to form a new party majority of white working-class voters. Will it work in the long run? B.

7. **Voice of the People.** The president is to speak for the American people in times of challenge and calamity, summing up the national mood and intention. President Trump, however, mainly seems to speak for the white working class group of voters who narrowly put him in the White House. To his credit, he is experimenting with a new form of communication – the Twitter tweet. He may join Franklin Roosevelt (radio) and Dwight Eisenhower (television) as a president who successfully exploited a new way of reaching the citizenry. But these first tweets have not appeared to be well thought out or checked with outside experts. C+.

8. **Emergency Manager.** The president is expected to take responsibility for leading the nation in times of emergency and dispatch aid quickly to suffering Americans and others. Thus floods, forest fires, tornados, hurricanes, etc., all demand the attention of the president. President Trump did a good job with the floods in Houston yet seems to be neglecting long term emergency needs in Puerto Rico (both places were hit by hurricanes). Trump should show more visible concern for victims of tragedy and spend more time visiting disaster sites. C.

9. **Chief Economist.** Like it or not, the American people require that a president bring the nation prosperity. If presidents fail at this, they and their political party are quickly punished by the voters. Trump gets high grades here. The economic revival from the Great Recession of 2008 has continued apace under Trump, with unemployment low and wages and salaries at last starting to go up. A.

10. **Leader of the only World Super Power.** This role has expanded since the end of World War II. First the president was "Leader of the Free World," then one of several "World Leaders," and since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the break-up of the Soviet Union he has become "Leader of the only World Super Power." Trump's "America First" ideology has greatly weakened his authority in world affairs. He also relies too much on personal

negotiation rather than working through existing international treaties and institutions. Trump could raise his grade here by working with foreign leaders, particularly U.S. allies, rather than confronting them. C.

Application of Role Theory to the first 18 months of the Trump presidency suggests that President Trump is not playing the ten roles of the presidency the way most previous presidents have played them. But there are roles, such as Commander in Chief of the military, Chief Legislator, and Chief Economist, where Trump is doing well.

Bob Loevy is a political scientist at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
8-11-2018

ENVISIONING A NEW COLORADO MEGA-CITY ON WESTERN SLOPE

By Robert D. Loevy

As the Colorado population continues to grow in future years, state leaders should steer the growth toward the Colorado River Valley from roughly Glenwood Springs through Rifle to Grand Junction.

This would be a high-density population corridor, much like the present Front Range population corridor, that would include large housing developments (with houses on relatively small lots), major shopping centers, big industrial parks, and interesting cultural facilities such as museums, performing arts centers, and the like.

The Colorado River banks would be kept in as natural a state as possible, but set back along both sides of the river would be intense urban development. This linear city could eventually become almost as large in population as the Front Range, which extends from Fort Collins and Greeley to Pueblo (via Denver and Colorado Springs).

Why should future state population growth be concentrated in this Colorado River Valley Corridor? There are many good reasons:

Most important, the people will be where the water is. Everyone is concerned about the future water supply for a growing Colorado. If population growth continues on the Front Range, Western Slope water, mainly from the Colorado River, will have to be diverted across the mountains to users in Denver, Fort Collins, Colorado Springs, etc. That will require expensive dams, reservoirs, and water tunnels under the Continental Divide.

Instead, put the people were the water is along the banks of the Colorado River, a major source of water in the state. That will eliminate the need for the expensive water transporting infrastructure required for sending Colorado River water over to the Front Range. This, in turn, will allow Colorado to use more of its water allotment from the Colorado River rather than letting it leave the state and be used elsewhere down river.

Another reason for concentrating future state population growth in the Colorado River Valley Corridor is that it will be handy to "the mountains," particularly the mountain areas that have been developed for snow skiing.

The great charm of living on the Front Range is that one can enjoy an urban and suburban life style but easily drive into the Rocky Mountains for skiing, hiking, horseback riding, rock climbing, auto touring to look at the beautiful scenery, and so on. The same beneficial relationship will exist for new settlers along the Colorado River. They will have the cosmopolitan benefits of living in a city but have mountain recreation nearby and readily available.

Particularly positive about turning the Colorado River Valley into a developed urban corridor is that the basic transportation infrastructure for such a corridor is already in place. Interstate 70 will provide fast automobile travel from Glenwood Springs at one end to Grand Junction at the other. In short, I-70 will provide the same service to the Colorado River Valley Corridor that I-25 gives to the Front Range.

And an active modern railroad, providing freight service and daily passenger service (Amtrak's *California Zephyr*), already runs through the corridor. The railroad can inexpensively bring in the lumber, roofing shingles, and other building materials needed to construct homes, offices, and stores in the corridor. Although the railroad is currently single-track, as the population grows the railroad could be double-tracked and frequent daily intercity passenger train service could be instituted.

And the railroad system could be expanded with future population growth. An unused but preserved railroad track runs from Dotsero (east of Glenwood Springs) to the western edge of Vail. And the existing railroad

runs up the Colorado River all the way to Granby (near Winter Park) and, through the Moffat Tunnel, to Denver. The railroad could provide a direct rail link between the Front Range Corridor and the proposed Colorado River Valley Corridor.

That is quite a combination cited above. This proposed corridor mega-city has the water needed for growth close by, is handy to the great recreational opportunities of the Rocky Mountains, and the basic transportation infrastructure is installed and operating.

But the real reason for steering future state population growth westward to the Colorado River Valley lies on the Front Range along the eastern edge of the Rocky Mountains. As corridors grow in population, they become congested with both people and automobiles. State and local governments are unable to keep up with the needs of large populations. Crowded schools and highways are just two of the unpleasant results.

There is no better proof of this on the Front Range than the jammed conditions, with frequent annoying delays, on I-25 both north and south of Denver. Directing population growth elsewhere can be a reasonable solution to this problem for the future.

Horace Greeley, for whom an important city in Colorado is named, said, "Go west, young man, go west." Consider changing that to, "Go west, new Coloradan, go west – to the Colorado River Valley Corridor."

Bob Loevy is a political scientist at Colorado College. He served on the Colorado Springs City Planning Commission from 1972 to 1975.

Colorado Springs Gazette
9-23-2018

UNDER COLORADO'S PURPLE UMBRELLA, BLUE AND RED WAVES

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

We have been studying Colorado's political party voting patterns in statewide elections for about three decades – and the major finding is that both parties remain competitive in Colorado.

Yes, there has been a modest shift from a slight Republican advantage to a slight Democratic advantage in the last decade, but other thing being equal, neither major party has a built-in partisan advantage in Colorado's upcoming statewide general elections for governor and other statewide offices such as attorney general, treasurer, and secretary of state.

But what is little understood is that Colorado has had continuing and steady blue and red waves at the county level.

Let's first look at the statewide trends. According to our longitudinal (over time) voting results analysis, Colorado was 51.8 percent Republican in the late 1980s but shifted to 50.5 percent Republican by 2016. That was a pretty modest move from R to D of just 1.3 percent.

We believe a state needs to be higher than 55 percent Democratic or Republican to be labeled "blue" or "red." California, Rhode Island, and New York are decidedly blue states. Alabama, Mississippi, Utah, and Kansas are decidedly red. Colorado is dead-center among the 50 states – essentially a purple-purple state.

Remember that Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush handily won Colorado. And statewide offices such as attorney general, treasurer, and attorney general have been virtually owned by Republicans in recent years

despite the recent Obama (president) and Hickenlooper (governor) wins for the Democrats.

But if the state of Colorado is solid purple, its counties are not. Our study revealed strong increases in Democratic voting in Denver and Boulder counties. Denver suburban counties Arapahoe and Jefferson shifted from Republican-leaning to evenly balanced. The state's three strong Republican counties – El Paso (Colorado Springs), Douglas (Castle Rock), and Weld (Greeley) – were only moderately gaining strength for the Republicans. Ski country is strongly Democratic. Farming-ranching counties are going heavily Republican.

The key statistic being used here is the Statewide Partisan Advantage, or SPA. It concentrates on the three most important statewide elections – U.S. president, Colorado governor, and U.S. senator. The percentage votes for these three elections are tracked over a period of 20 years and then averaged together into a single figure, which is the 20-year SPA for the state as of that particular year.

The presidency, governor, and U.S. senator are measured because these are the statewide elections to which the most attention is paid and in which voting turnouts are highest.

Denver's SPA was 58.1 D in 1988 but by 2016 had shifted 13.5 points to 71.6 D. Equally favorable for the Democrats was what happened in Boulder County, where the SPA went from 53.3 D in 1988 to 67.4 D in 2016, a shift to the Democrats of 14.1 points.

These shifts to the Democrats in Denver and Boulder counties from 1988 to 2016 have been vital to keeping the Democrats competitive in Colorado. Without those shifts in Denver and Boulder, Colorado would be a Republican state.

But also favoring the Democrats over the past two and a half decades have been two Denver suburban counties – Arapahoe and Jefferson counties – both of which had their SPA shift from Republican to just about even. From 1988 to 2016, Arapahoe County's SPA went from 59.1 R to 50.4 D, a

shift of 9.6 points to the Democrats. Jefferson County's SPA went from 56.2 R to 50.4 R with a shift of 5.8 points to the Democrats.

Note that Arapahoe and Jefferson counties shifted to the Democrats, but their SPAs over the last 20 years, at 50.4 percent D and 50.4 percent R, show them quite evenly balanced – which is why these are the super motherlode for campaign strategists in both parties.

Also shifting toward the Democrats were the skiing counties high in the Rocky Mountains. An example would be Pitkin County (Aspen), which moved its SPA 11.1 points Democratic from 58 D in 1988 to 69.1 D in 2016.

Disturbing news for the Republicans was that their three strongest counties were gaining Republican voters yet nowhere near as much as Denver and Boulder counties were gaining Democrats. El Paso County had an SPA of 60.2 R in 1988 that grew only 5 points to 65.2 R in 2016. Weld County went from 54.7 R in 1988 to 60.3 R in 2016, a Republican gain of 5.6 points. Douglas County dropped slightly from 65 R in 1988 to 64.3 R in 2016, a miniscule shift of .7 points toward the Democrats.

If Colorado's three best Republican counties grow only slowly (single digit increases) in their Republican percentages while Denver and Boulder continue to up their vote percentages (double digit increases) for the Democrats, Colorado will shortly become a blue state.

The big gainers for the Republicans are three dozen or so farmer-rancher counties scattered around the state that dramatically increased their SPAs to more Republican. Cheyenne County (Cheyenne Wells) on the eastern plains of Colorado went from 59.2 R in 1988 to 79.3 R in 2016, a Republican gain of a stunning 20.1 points. Out in Washington County (Akron) there was an 18.1 percent Republican gain from 61.2 R in 1988 to 79.3 R in 2016.

Rural counties have shifted strongly to the Republicans, but most of them are sparsely populated. Still, they help keep the entire state evenly balanced between Democrats and Republicans.

Notice the polarization occurring in Colorado over recent decades. Denver and Boulder counties have become much more Democratic, along

with the destination resort ski counties. The Republican counties (El Paso, Weld, and Douglas) are somewhat more Republican while the rural farmer-rancher counties are decidedly more Republican. Note however that this long term increasing polarization at the county level is basically cancelled out by blue and red intrastate waves that leave the entire state with a 20-year 2016 SPA of 50.5 percent R.

The SPA is based on voting periods of 20 years (1987-2016). Some observers have noted that Colorado has been more Democratic in the past 10 years, and they got it right. The 10-year SPA from 2007 to 2016 is 52.5 percent Democratic, a 3 percent shift from the 20-year SPA of 50.5 percent Republican. That is a good short-range shift for the Democrats, but the 52.5 Democratic figure for only ten years (2007 to 2016) shows Colorado as still a purple state. It needs to go to 55 percent in the 20-year SPA to be truly "blue."

Caution. We said earlier that – other things being equal – the political parties are evenly matched in Colorado. But other factors may play a larger than usual role in Colorado's November 6 election results. Term-limited Democratic governor John Hickenlooper has been unusually popular while Republican president Donald Trump is unpopular in Colorado. Democrats have momentum, money, and energized activists. Character, debate performance, and fundraising advantages probably will count more than usual this year.

Still, Colorado will remain a purple state for the foreseeable future.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
10-7-2018

MONEY IN POLITICS: AN AMERICAN CHALLENGE

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

In 1994 a resident of Colorado Springs named Mike Bird ran for the Republican nomination for governor of Colorado. He was an experienced politician and professional economist who had held a number of elected offices, slowly working his way up thought the political ranks. He spent eight years as a Colorado Springs city councilmember, getting elected president of the Colorado Municipal League along the way. He next won election to the Colorado House of Representatives, next the state Senate, and for a number of years held what many people believe to be the top legislative job in Colorado – chairman of the then all-powerful Joint Budget Committee.

When Mike Bird first announced his candidacy for the Republican nomination for governor, there was widespread approval in the news media. Clearly candidate Bird was a proven vote-getter and an experienced public official. He was the instant favorite to win the Republican nomination in 1994. One political writer noted: "There's only one person who knows Colorado better than incumbent Democratic governor Roy Romer – and that's Republican Mike Bird."

Then, suddenly, Bruce Benson, a millionaire oil man, decided to challenge Bird for the GOP nomination. Benson made clear he had plenty of money and was willing to spend it for lots of slick television commercials. The TV ads portrayed Benson (with oil wells pumping away in the background) as a savvy entrepreneur who could bring his successful business skills to running the state government of Colorado.

The impact on the news media was immediate. Mike Bird dropped instantly from frontrunner to almost out-of-sight. News reporters stopped writing about his press releases and his public appearances. The main topic of conversation in the news was which candidate had the most money (Benson) and thus was an odds-on sure bet to win the primary election.

It is our contention that the news media, seeing how much money Benson was spending, were "like deer frozen in the headlights." Blinded by all that campaign money, they stopped covering who would make the best governor of Colorado and concentrated on the money story.

State Senator Bird won the Colorado Republican Assembly, but, with the consequential impact of countless TV ads, Benson won the Republican primary. Incumbent Democratic governor Roy Romer was well-fortified with money too, however, and won the general election. Benson went on to do a fine job applying his business skills as president of the University of Colorado.

Everyone knows our political process is awash in money. This is unlikely to change even though two-thirds of the American public support a variety of campaign fund-raising reforms. The campaign with the biggest war chest does not always win, yet the correlation of money with victory is high.

A Republican candidate for governor this year loaned his primary election campaign $5 million in an unsuccessful bid for the GOP nomination. Democratic candidate for governor Jared Polis is reportedly giving his campaign something in the range of $15 to $20 million.

Millions of campaign dollars, many from outside of Colorado, are pouring into this state's U.S. House District 6 election. The money in this one U.S. House election could go as high as $8 million or more.

There are several restrictions in Colorado on how much one can give to candidates. And there are campaign contribution disclosure rules. Yet there are no limits on a wealthy candidate self-funding his or her campaign. That is how Donald Trump overwhelmed his Republican primary opponents in 2016.

The U.S. Supreme Court has essentially ruled that regulating how a person spends their own money in their own campaign would be to deny a person their First Amendment right of Freedom of Speech. Thus a person's campaign donation to their own campaign must be unregulated, just as newspapers, books, or billboards cannot be regulated.

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 2010 in *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission* that candidates can avoid campaign finance restrictions by forming undisclosed "independent" committees that spend in parallel with the candidate's regular campaign.

Candidates who are not rich must spend hours every day to raise vast sums of money, mostly from wealthy people or special interest groups, and this raises serious questions about the integrity of our constitutional democracy.

There is a proposed Colorado constitutional amendment on the November 6th ballot that tries to lessen a millionaire's advantage in state elections. It would raise campaign contribution limits per person in statewide elections five times over the limit (to $5,750) for candidates running against opponents who have contributed more than $1 million to their campaign.

This amendment is likely to be approved because it sounds like a fairness reform – helping David to compete equally with Goliath. But this is hardly the cure for large imbalances in Colorado political fundraising, and thus is largely a lame measure.

We voters and the news media need to educate ourselves to "look beyond the money" and investigate the policies and principles that will guide prospective office holders. This is hard to do with the barrage of candidate and issue commercials constantly on our TVs and internet devices. Sadly, simplistic negative "cut-down" ads work. Serious policy issues can seldom be addressed in 30-second TV ads or on bumper stickers or postcard mailings.

Voters should check out candidate and party websites for more detailed information. Voters should also look for reports that deemphasize which candidates are winning the money race and are leading in pre-election

day polls. Voters should turn to news sources that emphasize a candidate's policy solutions and which candidates would make the best elected officeholders.

Finally we call on whoever is the next governor to establish a commission to examine promising state level campaign finance reforms. Arizona, Connecticut, Maine, and Montana are experimenting with reforms that might work and be constitutional.

Every citizen should have the right of access to impartial facts, criticism, and competing ideas about all the plausible candidates for office. The integrity of the American democracy requires a system of free, fair, and open elections untainted by money. Colorado has not yet figured out a way to effectively regulate money in politics, but we must press on to make character and ideas more important than money in our elections.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
10-12-2018

TELEVISION DEBATES OFFER VOTERS BEST VIEW OF CANDIDATES

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

The Colorado governor election is in the midst of a series of "television debates." This relatively new form of electoral campaigning – since the famous Kennedy/Nixon presidential debate in 1960 – is the best way for voters to see and hear the gubernatorial candidates live and not in pre-packaged carefully programmed TV and internet ads.

Commentators have been lamenting how little live exposure the 2018 candidates are allowing in their campaigns to gain the governor's office. Where are the torch light parades led by the candidates snaking through the city or town, the major speeches before large wildly cheering crowds of supporters, and bus tours for local handshaking to the far ends of Colorado? Not much this time around.

Both Democrat Jared Polis and Republican Walker Stapleton have deemphasized these kinds of public politicking in favor of letting pre-recorded TV and internet commercials do the heavy lifting. One of the reasons for this is to avoid, when campaigning live, the mistaken gestures and misstatements that can be exploited by the opposition.

But the style of "television debates" that Kennedy and Nixon so famously pioneered 58 years ago has filtered down to major state elections in the United States. The two candidates for major state offices are expected to go on television, where large audiences can see them, and make the case for their election face-to-face.

The key word here is "television." When Kennedy and Nixon first met the debate cameras in 1960, the three major television networks developed a

format to work well with TV. No long speeches followed by long rebuttals. The candidates would be asked questions by television news reporters, who were often media stars themselves, and the candidates' answers would be kept short by timing them. The same time limits were imposed on each candidate's rebuttals.

Another format was to have the candidates answer questions from the audience rather than a popular newscaster.

This "electronic" style of debating became exceedingly popular with the news media. Candidates for governor now have to do some debating on television. They cannot turn down every offer to debate their opponent without risking a flurry of criticism from the news commentators.

Over the years, at the presidential level and a good bit at the state level, five rules have evolved for candidates going into television debates with their opponents:

1. Look good! Project both energy and charm. In that legendary first presidential debate in 1960, Kennedy appeared suntanned and rested while Richard Nixon, who was heavily made-up, seemed pasty faced and tired. Kennedy was declared the winner of the debate (his appearance helped), and the resulting publicity gave a boost to Kennedy's efforts to win what was a close election.
2. Try to launch a zinger or two, and be wary of zingers by your opponent. A "zinger" is a short pithy statement by one of the debaters that makes his opponent look bad and is easily recalled by the watching public. The best zinger of all was fired off in a vice-presidential debate when the Republican candidate for vice-president, Dan Quayle, compared his youthful rise in politics to President John F. (Jack) Kennedy. Quayle's Democratic opponent, Lloyd Benson, retorted: "Senator, you are no Jack Kennedy." That zinger became a popular put-down line said whenever a politician goes too far in bragging about his or her achievements.
3. Do not make any major gaffes. Getting facts wrong, or accidentally defaming a major voting group, can quickly become the most

memorable moment at a "television debate." Republican President Gerald Ford in 1976 made the strange argument that, although it was the height of the Cold War, the Soviet Union did not "dominate Eastern Europe," an obvious fact to all since the end of World War II. Ford narrowly lost the election to Democrat Jimmy Carter, and many blamed this Ford gaffe for causing the loss.

4. Be careful with small or large physical gestures during the debate. President George H. W. Bush was caught by the TV camera looking at his watch during a television debate with Democrat Bill Clinton and independent Ross Perot in 1992. It suggested Bush the elder sensed he was losing the debate and did not want to be there. In 2000 Democrat Al Gore improperly walked up to within a foot of Republican George W. Bush while Bush was entitled to be talking. The negative reaction to Gore doing an over-the-top invasion of Bush's personal space hurt the Gore campaign.
5. Make certain your policy suggestions are understandable and sensible. Convey that you have priorities and that you will have the political skill to have them enacted. Explain how government will have the financial resources to implement those priorities.

We urge Coloradans to try and catch as many of the remaining Jared Polis/Walker Stapleton debates as time permits. We watched the recent RMPBS airing of the Polis-Stapleton debate in Grand Junction. Both seemed rested prepared, and earnest. Each of them predictably accused the other of being too far from the mainstream and too uncaring of Colorado's middle class.

Coloradans on the blue side of the aisle will be mostly persuaded by Polis. The red side of the aisle will find Stapleton much more attractive. This is decidedly a blue vs. red race. As in most cases in Colorado voting, this race will be decided by independents.

These television debates, in an age of pre-canned information in TV and internet ads, are the best way to see the candidates for the Colorado governorship live and in active competition with their opponent. Keep an

eye out for which candidate looks the best and projects energy. Note zingers, big gaffes, and improper physical gestures should they occur. Look also for coherent and workable policy proposals.

We are grateful presidential-style television debates have filtered down to the state level. We would hardly see anything "live" of the gubernatorial candidates without them.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
10-14-2018

RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE 2018 STATE BALLOT QUESTIONS

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

If you vote in the November 6th elections, you will have 13 statewide ballot issues on which to make a decision. There are nine proposed amendments to the Colorado state constitution and four proposed state laws. Here are our recommendations:

Amendment V – Lower Age Requirements for Members of the State Legislature. The writers of the U.S. Constitution set age limits for holding office at 25 for the U.S. House, 30 for the U.S. Senate, and 35 for U.S. President. They argued an elected official needed a certain amount of life experience before holding office and making rules and regulations for others. On the other hand, we want to encourage young people to take more interest in politics by lowering the state legislative age requirement from 25 to 21.

Cronin For
Loevy Against
Prediction: Adopted

Amendment W – Election Ballot Format for Judicial Retention Elections. We are shocked that anything this trivial and detailed is in the state constitution and requires a vote of the people to make a change. Minor issues like this should be decided by the legislature and the governor. The amendment will reduce repeating the words "Shall Judge So-and-so of such-and-such court be retained in office?" on the judicial retention ballot. The new ballot wording is a bit more confusing than the old one.

Cronin Against
Loevy Against
Prediction: Rejected

Amendment X – Industrial Hemp Definition. This is another item that should not be in the state constitution, but it rode in with the legalization of recreational marijuana in 2012. Amendment X would eliminate the definition of industrial hemp from the state constitution and have the definition set by U.S. law or Colorado law. The major gain is less regulation of the hemp industry in Colorado.

Cronin For
Loevy For
Prediction: Adopted

Amendment Y – Congressional Redistricting. The district lines for Colorado's seven members of the U.S. House of Representatives are drawn by the state legislature, but in virtually all cases recently the legislature has not agreed on the new lines and the actual drawing of congressional district boundaries took place in the courts. This is an item of government procedure that belongs in the state constitution.

Amendment Y will create a new Congressional Redistricting Commission consisting of four Democrats, four Republicans, and four unaffiliated voters. It is assumed the presence of unaffiliated voters will prevent either the Democrats or the Republicans from drawing congressional district lines favorable to their political party, a process known as gerrymandering. The Commission is instructed to, among other things, draw congressional districts that are politically competitive.

Cronin For
Loevy For
Prediction: Adopted

Amendment Z – Legislative Redistricting. This referred constitutional amendment would create the Independent Legislative Redistricting Commission to draw boundary lines for state House of Representative districts and state Senate districts. It would closely resemble

the congressional district commission created in Amendment Y (four Democrats, four Republicans, four unaffiliated voters, etc.).

It would replace an existing Reapportionment Commission which can easily be dominated by one political party or the other and result in gerrymandering. Similar to Amendment Y, Amendment Z belongs in the state constitution.

Cronin For

Loevy For

Prediction: Adopted

Amendment A – Prohibit Slavery and Involuntary Servitude in All Circumstances. The Colorado constitution prohibits slavery and involuntary servitude, *except as punishment for a crime for which a person has been convicted.* This referred constitutional amendment would remove the phrase in italics above, making slavery and involuntary servitude illegal under all conditions. The enabling legislation for Amendment A emphasizes that voluntary work programs, with their positive benefits, will still be available in all state prison programs.

Cronin For

Loevy For

Prediction: Adopted

Amendment 73 – Funding for Public Schools. This amendment would increase public school funding by raising taxes on incomes over $100,000 in a range from $185 to $24,395 per year. It would raise the average corporate tax by $14,395 per year.

Public schools are important in Colorado, but constitutional amendments that earmark tax increases for a particular interest group (public schools are an interest group) are unfair to the many other facets of Colorado government that need more money. We might feel differently about this proposal if it were an initiated ordinance rather than a hard-to-change constitutional amendment.

Cronin 2/3 For
Loevy Against
Prediction: Rejected

Amendment 74 – Compensation for Fair Market Value by Government Law or Regulation. This amendment expands the circumstances under which the state or a local government is required to provide compensation to a property owner. Thus if a government limits natural gas development on a property, an owner of mineral rights could file a claim for the reduced value of the property.

This appears to be an effort to guarantee payments to mineral rights owners if the state or local governments restrict drilling for oil and gas close to homes and schools. The state constitution currently protects those rights well. This amendment could result in expensive law suits against the state and local governments. Also, such detailed treatment of a minor issue does not belong in the state constitution.

Cronin Against
Loevy Against
Prediction: Rejected

Amendment 75 – Campaign Contributions. Designed to correct the problem that millionaires can finance their own election campaigns without spending limits, this amendment would allow competitors to exceed the per person contribution limit by 5 times. The present $1,150 limit per contributor would be raised to $5,750 if an opponent contributes $1 million to his or her own campaign.

There is no real purpose to this constitutional amendment. All candidates can escape contribution limits by forming independent expenditure committees that can spend money without limits. And, even if this were a good idea, it would not belong in the state constitution but should be a regular law.

Cronin Against
Loevy Against
Prediction: Approved

Proposition 109 – Authorize Bonds for Highway Projects. To its great credit, this proposal would change state *law* rather than the state *constitution*. Flaws could be corrected by the state legislature and the governor if necessary in the future. In the main, however, the state legislature and the governor respect initiated laws approved by the voters and are reluctant to change them unless absolutely necessary.

Proposition 109 would increase bridge and road spending by $1 billion dollars over 20-years with borrowed money. It would also borrow money to pay for currently authorized bridge and road programs. The borrowed money would be paid back out of the state budget without an increase in taxes and thus may require cuts in other state programs such as public education and health care for the poor.

Cronin Against
Loevy Against
Prediction: Rejected

Proposition 110 – Authorize Sales Tax and Bonds for Transportation Projects. This would change state law rather than the state constitution. It is a 20-year road and bridge spending increase that is paid for with a rise in state sales tax from 2.9 percent to 3.52 percent. The state would borrow up to $6 billion for future transportation expenses – 45 percent to the state, 40 percent to local governments, and 15 percent to rail passenger, bus, bike, and other multi-modal projects.

This proposition requires a major tax increase, but it represents a major effort to do something about the woeful condition of Colorado roads and bridges.

Cronin For
Loevy For
Prediction: Approved

Proposition 111 – Limitations on Payday Loans. This would change state law rather than the state constitution. The total cost of payday loans – small short-term loans – would be set at 36 percent per year. The present complicated interest and fees structure would be eliminated.

Lowering the cost of poor people borrowing small amounts of money in difficult situations sounds like a good idea, yet there is the risk this initiated law might drive many payday lenders out of business and leave many poor people without a quick source of emergency funds.

Cronin For
Loevy For
Prediction: Approved

Proposition 112 – Increased Setback Requirement for Oil and Natural Gas Development. This would change state law rather than the state constitution. The setback requirements on new oil and gas developments (drilling) would be raised from 500/1000 feet (depending on the land use) to 2500 feet.

This is one of the most important issues on this ballot. Cities, towns, and counties in Colorado are struggling to regain control over how close oil and gas drilling and wells can be to homes, neighborhoods, and schools. Residential values and personal health and safety are at stake. On the other hand, oil and gas production is one of the vital industries in the state, and fossil fuels are badly needed by U.S. industries and consumers. This is a classic showdown between local v. state and also neighborhoods v. the extractive energy industry. This issue cries out for a creative and sensible compromise solution by the state legislature.

Cronin Against
Loevy For
Prediction: Rejected

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
10-20-2018

TWO SIGNS SUGGEST HICKENLOOPER IS RUNNING FOR THE DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION FOR PRESIDENT

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

It is getting real. Two signs suggest Colorado Governor John Hickenlooper truly is running for the Democratic Party nomination for president of the United States.

The first sign is that former Republican Speaker of the House Frank McNulty has charged Hickenlooper with violating ethics laws by traveling to meetings in private jets paid for by private interests. The Colorado Independent Ethics Commission will decide the validity of the charges.

We doubt Republican McNulty would be going after Hickenlooper in this way if McNulty did not consider Hickenlooper a serious Democratic candidate for president.

The second sign is that term-limited Colorado Governor John Hickenlooper has announced a committee to help him mastermind his 2020 campaign for president. It's called the Giddy Up PAC. The first item on the committee's agenda should be making strategy for winning the first four Democratic Party presidential caucuses and primaries – in Iowa, New Hampshire, South Carolina, and Nevada.

Term-limited is an important point. Unless he gets another job, Governor Hickenlooper will be unemployed, yet wealthy, when he ends his state constitutionally mandated eight years in office in early January of 2019. Unemployment is good for U.S. presidential nomination candidates. If he decides to go that route, Hickenlooper can spend most of his time campaigning in one, two, three, or maybe all four of those early caucuses-primary states.

It has been done. In 1976 former Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter, relatively unknown outside the South, spent as much time as he could for a year campaigning in Iowa for the Democratic nomination. He shook hands, kissed babies, and spoke at countless coffees and Rotary Club meetings. It paid off when Carter came in first in Iowa and went from there to the White House the following November.

The Hickenlooper campaign team should consider the Carter strategy of full-time campaigning for a year in the early caucuses-primary states. If a relative political unknown like Carter could do it, certainly Hickenlooper could adopt the "total year of campaigning" strategy and win too.

The next question for the Hickenlooper campaign committee should be which of the four early caucuses-primaries states to concentrate time and money in:

Iowa caucuses. The state with the first caucuses is only one state away from Colorado. Unfortunately, the intervening state, Nebraska, is about 400 miles wide, a little too far for the folks in Iowa to think of Colorado and its recent governor as close neighbors. There are Iowans who like to vacation in Colorado, however, so maybe Hickenlooper can play up that angle.

The problem for Hickenlooper is that Iowa is predominantly an agricultural state. It lacks the large urban-suburban populations of the Colorado Front Range, thus giving Iowans little in common with Coloradans. Another problem is that Iowa's population is spread out over a large area. A lot of driving or flying in charter airplanes is required to campaign in Iowa.

If Hick makes a play in the Iowa caucuses, he should get his photo taken in front of the grain elevators on the eastern plains of Colorado and celebrate the "Pedal to the Plains" bicycle tours. He should push the idea that dealing with the eastern plains for eight years as governor has given him a real sensitivity to agricultural issues.

New Hampshire primary. Hickenlooper makes a good fit in this New England state with the first presidential primary. Most of the

population of New Hampshire lives in the southern part of the state along the Massachusetts border. New Hampshire thus is basically a distant northern suburb of Boston, which means an urban-suburban population that is highly similar to the Colorado Front Range. Furthermore, because of the cold snowy climate, New Hampshire folks dress like Coloradans – down jackets, thick gloves, and snow boots. Also New Hampshire has mountains to the north and skiing close by. Hickenlooper, a skier himself and sometimes described as quirky, should fit right in.

New Hampshire lets unaffiliated voters choose which primary – Democratic or Republican – they want to vote in. With his moderate and middle-of-the-road image, Hickenlooper might really appeal to these unaffiliated voters, a substantial voting bloc. In 2000, maverick Arizona U.S. Senator John McCain carried the New Hampshire unaffiliated voters strongly.

New Hampshire also is small. Unlike Iowa, it is not a long drive from one picturesque village to another where Hickenlooper can do all the required "town halls." If Hickenlooper decides to concentrate all his efforts in just one early caucuses-primary state, New Hampshire would be the obvious choice.

South Carolina primary. Unless he has scored a big victory in either Iowa or New Hampshire or both, Hickenlooper should not invest heavily in South Carolina. The Democratic Party added it to the caucuses-primary schedule in 2008 to give southern voters and African-American voters a stronger voice in the nomination process. Easing up in South Carolina will be a particularly good idea if there is a strong southern or African-American candidate running.

Nevada caucuses. The Democratic Party added Nevada to the schedule in 2008 to give a western state with a substantial Hispanic population a role in the early going. It presents a unique opportunity for Hickenlooper as Colorado is a western state with Hispanic voters, and Hickenlooper has demonstrated twice that he can get that combination to vote for him.

Because it votes fourth, Nevada could be a big supporting win for Hickenlooper if he wins in Iowa, or New Hampshire, or both. It could also be a comeback state for Hick if he does only moderately well in the first three caucuses-primaries. After New Hampshire, Nevada deserves a lot of campaign attention from Hickenlooper.

These are the kinds of things Hickenlooper's strategists should be thinking and arguing about. The 2020 presidential caucuses-primaries may seem far in the future to many, but to a man who would be president they need to be thought about and planned for right now.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
10-27-2018

POLITICAL CONTENTION EXPLAINED BY FIVE "P" WORDS

By Robert D. Loevy

Do Colorado and American politics seem unusually divisive and fractious to you as the state and the nation head into the 2018 mid-term elections? Political scientists have an explanation for that, and it is all due to five words that start with the letter "P."

More **PARTISAN –** The two political parties have become very strong in terms of defining their positions and enforcing those positions on their elected officials. Party line voting is widely practiced at the moment in Congress in Washington, D.C., and also in the Colorado state legislature in Denver. Partisanship is so strong that it is said to be diminishing even social interactions between Democratic and Republican elected officials.

More **PHILOSPHICAL** – The two political parties are more ideological and less practical in their perspectives. The Republicans have become committed to ideas associated with the religious right, so called social issues, such as opposing abortion and limiting the rights of gays and lesbians. Also the Republicans have become ever more strongly opposed to government being used to solve major social problems, such as education and medical care. On the other hand, the Democrats are advocating high-spending government proposals such as free tuition to community colleges, free medical care for everyone, and heavy spending on infrastructure problems, such as rebuilding highways and constructing high-speed passenger railroads between major cities.

More **POLARIZED –** As the Republicans and Democrats have become more philosophically divided from one another, they simultaneously

have grown less able to compromise with one another. They each tend to sit in their own corner of the political realm and stand pat on their beliefs and programs. This polarization is supported by super-partisan political commentators in the news media who draw audiences by taking extreme rather than moderate positions on major issues. Polarization is also aided by plurality primary elections, where many candidates run but only one is nominated. This tempts candidates to run at the extreme, rather than in the middle, in hopes of being "the first of many" to win the party nomination. Run-off elections between the top two finishers, not used in partisan primary elections in Colorado, would reduce some of this polarization.

More **POLITICIZED** – In the highly charged political atmosphere which currently exists, even minor issues and events are politicized in hopes of giving one political party or the other an advantage. A recent example was an encounter at a teen-age party many years ago in Maryland that was politicized in an attempt to stop the Senate confirmation of Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh, who was appointed by Republican President Donald Trump. Another example is high-speed intercity passenger rail. The Democrats are for it. The Republicans are against it. The relevant issues, whether high-speed rail is needed and will work or not, are barely discussed.

More **PARALYSIS** – The end result of the first four words that start with "P" – partisan, philosophical, polarized, and politicized – is paralysis. When political parties are sharply divided on the major issues facing a state or a nation, there is an inability on the part of the president and Congress, as well as governors and state legislators, to act together to accomplish common purposes. The two political parties balance each other, and often little is achieved other than uneasy maintenance of the status quo.

This has been particularly true in Colorado in recent years. Despite a constitutional mandate to spend big dollars on kindergarten through high school education, the Democrats and Republicans year after year fail to agree on how to come up with truly adequate funds. The two political parties so far have been unable to articulate a common plan for regulating water in this semi-arid state. The most conspicuous paralysis has been over Colorado

roads and bridges, which keep deteriorating while the two political parties argue about funding needed for repairs and expansion.

That is the reason interest groups turn to ballot questions initiated by voter signatures to get governmental action. That is why educational support and roads and bridges issues are on the ballot at the upcoming 2018 mid-term elections this November 6.

So accept the fact that you live in a time of high political competition and partisan bitterness. The phenomenon has been well-documented by political scientists and their five words starting with the letter "P."

Bob Loevy is a political scientist at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
10-5-2018

WILL A BLUE WAVE WASH OVER COLORADO? HERE'S WHAT TO WATCH ON ELECTION NIGHT

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Here is what to watch for as the votes come in on election night, Tuesday, November 6, 2018.

Two political waves could be washing across Colorado on election night. The first is a "blue wave" of Democratic votes from folks who dislike Republican President Donald Trump. The second is a "big dollars" wave of Democratic votes caused by the fact Democratic gubernatorial candidate Jared Polis has spent more than $20 million of his own money to defeat Republican Walker Stapleton.

The major question is: how big will those two waves be when they arrive in Colorado on election night? Will Democrat Jared Polis win in a landslide, or will he just barely squeak into office?

The answer matters. If Polis wins big for the Democrats, he doubtless will have "coattails." That is, he could elect another Democrat or two for statewide positions and shift the partisan balance in the state Senate. That means you want to watch for the results from state attorney general (Democrat Phil Weiser vs. Republican George Brauchler) and state treasurer (Democrat Dave Young against Republican Brian Watson) contests. Secretary of State Wayne Williams, a Republican, is expected to be elected regardless of the waves.

Democrats have frequently won the governorship in recent years while the Republicans take the three lesser statewide offices. If the Republicans can retain two or three of those offices, that will be good news

for the GOP. But if the Republicans lose two or three as well as the governorship, it will be a decisive electoral victory for the Democrats.

It will be really dispiriting news for Republicans if George Brachler and Wayne Williams are beaten. The Democrats will have "cut off at the roots" two very promising future Republican candidates for statewide offices, such as the governorship or U.S. senator.

Next let's look at the two Republican seats for the U.S. House of Representatives, where Colorado voters have the opportunity to support – or frustrate – Democratic hopes of changing the U.S. House from a Republican majority to a Democratic majority.

All eyes will be glued on Colorado U.S. House District 6 in Aurora, where incumbent Republican Mike Coffman is in the fight of his political life to keep a seat gerrymandered by the Democrats to be a Democratic seat. He has defended the seat in the past against solid Democratic opponents, but the burden of Donald Trump (blue wave) and Polis coattails (big dollar wave) and a strong opponent have put him behind in the polls against Democrat Jason Crow. If Coffman is reelected, it will be a big boost for Colorado Republicans, but Crow's chances of winning the seat look good.

We also will be keeping an eye on Colorado U.S. House District 3, which stretches across southern and western Colorado from Pueblo to Grand Junction to Steamboat Springs. Republican incumbent Scott Tipton is challenged by Democrat Diane Mitsch Bush. If Bush beats Tipton and goes to Washington, D.C., in his place, the Democrats will likely gain majority control of the U.S. House. And if so, the blue wave and Jared Polis's coattails will have reached into every part of Colorado.

And now the ultimate test for the blue wave and Polis coattails. We will be watching to see if the Democrats can win any of the county offices in El Paso County, where the major city is Colorado Springs. El Paso County is the biggest Republican vote-producing county in the state. If the Democrats elect a county commissioner or the county clerk and recorder, which is unlikely, we would have to label the 2018 elections in Colorado a total blowout for the Democrats.

We will be checking on Colorado state Senate races to see if the Democrats can switch control of the state Senate from the present narrow (one seat) Republican majority to Democratic. If that happens and Democrat Jared Polis wins the governorship, the Democrats will control the three major elected sections of Colorado state government – the governor's office, the state Senate, and the Colorado House of Representatives, which is already safely Democratic.

Republicans and others should not be despairing about the Democrats dominating under the state capitol dome in Denver, because a party's power to get things done is severely limited by past constitutional amendments, including the famed Tabor Amendment, which severely limits the power of the legislature and governor to raise revenues and thereby increase expenditures.

What we and many others are concerned about are the ballot issues that the state's electorate is voting on this Election Day, because these could make a real difference in how the state is governed and what kind of money could be available to support needed state services.

We will be frowning if Proposition 109 changes state law to use bonds to raise $3.5 billion for state highway projects. We object because Proposition 109 does not raise state taxes to pay for the bonds and thus would almost inevitably steal money in the general budget from schools and state medical programs.

We will both be happy if Proposition 110 passes and raises state sales taxes to pay off $6 billion in state and local road and bridge projects, but in recent years Colorado voters have been leery of statewide tax increases.

We will be watching Amendment 73. It will raise a much needed $1.6 billion for public schools, which we support, but the taxes to pay for it will fall heavily on wealthy taxpayers and corporations.

Along with everyone else, we will be watching Proposition 112, a change in state law. The setback requirements on new oil and gas developments (drilling) would be raised from 500/1000 feet (depending on the land use) to 2500 feet.

This measure is understandably supported by neighborhoods that have drilling facilities nearby, yet its impact on the Colorado economy could be large. The energy industry has spent more money to defeat Proposition 112 than Jared Polis has spent in his highly financed effort to win the governorship. We would much prefer that this type of decision be crafted by the state legislature and the governor at the state capitol and not at the ballot box.

Let's thank all of those who ran for office this election season. And, regardless of our partisan affiliations, we can rejoice that the yard signs are coming down, the political postcards will stop coming to our mailboxes, and the negative TV ads will be gone for a while.

But, alas, we will be having Colorado Springs city elections next spring, And Democrats such as former State Senator Michael Johnston will be announcing their candidacy for the U.S. Senate seat now held by Republican Cory Gardner, up for reelection in 2020. And our term-limited Governor John Hickenlooper is already running hard for the Democratic nomination for president of the United States, also up in 2020.

Politics just goes on and on.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
11-11-2018

POLITICAL CULTURE OF COLORADO REMAINS PURPLE

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Team Blue "ran the table" in last Tuesday's Colorado state elections. It's been "four score and two" years, in 1936, since Democrats won all four statewide elected positions in the state – governor, treasurer, attorney general, and secretary of state – and won majorities in both houses of the state legislature.

What accounts for this sweep? Turnout was unusually high among unaffiliated and first-time voters. Republican turnout was uncharacter-istically low. Democratic campaigns, such as Polis for Governor and Griswold for Secretary of State, spent way more money than their opponents' campaigns. The winning Jason Crow for Congress campaign also was helped by a larger war chest than that of his opponent – losing incumbent Republican Mike Coffman.

Denver suburbs, like suburbs across the country, turned more Democratic, in rebuffing President Trump's populist nativism. Mid-term elections are traditionally hard on the party of incumbent presidents. Clinton had even bigger losses in 1994, as did Bush in 2006 and Obama in both 2010 and 2014.

If Colorado voters placed more trust in Democratic candidates than in Republican candidates this past week, they were still decidedly against raising taxes. They said no to a proposed major increase for public schools, and no to two different proposals to spend more on highways and bridge building. They also sided with the energy industry, in voting against stricter regulations on fracking and related oil and gas activities.

This split decision – let Democrats govern the state, but do not give the state any more taxes – is another example of the purple political culture of Colorado.

Here are other reflections on the 2018 Colorado elections:

Voting results in Colorado paralleled voting results nationwide: Dems did well, turnout was up, there were more first-time voters, independents were more energized, and suburbs were more central to the outcome. In Colorado, as the nation, there is a gender gap, an age gap and a rural/suburban/urban gap.

Public opinion polls, both in Colorado and in the nation, were almost universally accurate.

The invisibility of the candidates for Lieutenant Governor was striking this year. Former-Lieutenant Governor Joe Garcia, as we recall, was much more visible in 2010 and 2014. Quick quiz question: Can you name the two major-party candidates for this year's Lieutenant Governor's race? Bet you can't.

One of the biggest surprises of this election was the defeat of incumbent Republican Secretary of State Wayne Williams. Most politically active people and most pundits thought he would win. Most people, including even his opponent, praised him for his professional performance. Wayne's wife Holly Williams rolled up a 70 percent plus victory in her El Paso County Commissioner race on the same day her husband lost. We can only conclude that the "anti-Trump" blue wave and the Polis "money wave" resulted in Wayne Williams's defeat as collateral damage.

Another big event this election cycle was the success Democrats had in winning legislative districts. These were predominantly in the Denver metro area. Our guess is that the Democratic wins were powered by greater turn-outs by progressive leaning independents, higher turnouts by women and first-time voters, and by larger than usual campaign contributions.

Is there any sort of silver lining for Republicans this year? The anti-tax ballot issue results are one positive. Another indicator of a still divided state is that Dems won barely 51 percent of the vote for down-ballot elected

officials. And in the governor's race, although Polis out-spent, out-campaigned and out-debated his opponent, he still won statewide voting by only 53 percent. Other Democratic governors from the recent past, including Dick Lamm, Roy Romer and even Bill Ritter, won more decisive electoral victories than Polis won this year.

Two other consolations for Republicans: as of this year, Republicans still hold many governorships, even in very blue states such as Massachusetts, Maryland and Vermont. And here in Colorado, history shows that a Republican such as former-Governor Bill Owens can win the governorship even after the state has had two very popular Democratic governors.

The Republican Party in Colorado has been wounded, but it will rise up in the future and see more promising election days.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Not Used
11-20-2018

THE HIDDEN WINNERS IN COLORADO IN 2018 – THE LIBERTARIANS

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

The Democratic Party's solid win over the Republicans in the 2018 mid-term elections in Colorado has been well-documented. But what about Colorado's third largest political party – the Libertarians? How did they do?

At first glance, not too well. Although the Libertarians ran candidates for many of the more prominent electoral offices in Colorado, they did not win anything. The two major parties dominated at the ballot box. The Libertarian Party candidates mainly polled in the low single digits.

But there is more to the Libertarian Party than meets the eye in Colorado. Let's take a minute to think about them.

Libertarian Party members and those who "lean libertarian" simply do not like government, and they particularly dislike government when it takes money from hard-working employed taxpayers and redistributes it to other people in the form of free government services. It is your money, the libertarians argue, and you should get to spend all of it the way you want to – not the way the taxing government wants to.

Instead of the government building and maintaining roads, libertarians argue, private companies should build them and the individuals who drive on them should pay the required toll. Instead of public schools, libertarians say, everyone should use their own money to send their children to the private school of their preference.

What the libertarians have been good at in Colorado is using amendments to the state constitution to enforce libertarian ideas on Democrats, Republicans, and unaffiliated voters alike. The prime example is

TABOR, a 1992 constitutional amendment that requires "a vote on all tax increases."

That sounds simple enough, but the fact is that successfully getting a tax increase approved by the voters requires two things. 1. Strong public support from elected leaders. 2. Major fund raising, in the millions of dollars, to support the tax increase vote with statewide advertising.

Over the quarter century we have had TABOR in Colorado, statewide elected officials have proven resistant to supporting the votes on tax increases required by TABOR. They fear that being associated with a tax increase could harm their future electoral career, particularly if the increased tax proposal is defeated in the election.

The libertarian cause has benefitted from this syndrome. Tax increase proposals, lacking open and enthusiastic support from elected leaders, seem to go down at the polls one after the other. The result is a slow starving of government services in Colorado, particularly K-12 public schools, roads and highways construction and maintenance, and higher education.

So let's look at the results of the 2018 mid-term elections in Colorado from a libertarian perspective. A major proposal to increase financing of public schools, with a major increase in taxes on high-earners, was solidly defeated by the electorate. That was good news for libertarians. The idea that "a vote on a tax means no tax" was confirmed with the resultant negative impact on public school expenditures.

There was a proposal on the 2018 mid-term ballot to try to fix the sagging roads and bridges in Colorado. It would have increased state sales taxes to pay for new roads and highways. Neither of the major party candidates for governor backed it. It went down to the expected inglorious defeat, in effect leaving the state with no coherent roads and highway program.

But then those two smashing defeats of state tax increases were joined by an even more exciting "win" for the libertarian-leaning. The winning candidate for state governor was a Democrat, Jared Polis, with bold spending plans for expanded pre-schools and all-day kindergarten. Yet he

announced after the election to both 9-NEWS in Denver and ColoradoPolitics.com that "a vote on all tax increases" was one of the major conclusions to be drawn from the 2018 elections. One might conclude Colorado now has a Democratic-libertarian governor who promises big things with his Democratic half and takes away the tax increases needed to support them with his libertarian half.

Two proposed tax increases smashed to smithereens by the voters and an incoming leftist governor strongly endorsing "a vote on all tax increases." That's a lot for Libertarians and the libertarian leaning to be happy about in the 2018 mid-terms in Colorado. Libertarians should hold a party and pass out the champagne.

Being libertarians of course, each person will have to pay for her or his own champagne.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
11-26-2018

LIBERTARIAN SPIRIT IN COLORADO

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

The Democratic Party's stunning victories in Colorado's 2018 elections are now well documented. Regular Democrats and regular Republicans predictably voted for their party's candidates. But three things were different this year:

First, Colorado has seen a surge of newly registered unaffiliated voters (or independent) voters over the past few years.

Second, nearly 60 percent of Colorado's unaffiliated voters supported Democratic Governor-elect Jared Polis and Democratic 6th District US Representative-elect Jason Crow.

Third, Donald Trump is US president and his disapproval rating is much greater here in Colorado than in the nation. Colorado Republican candidates tried, to no avail, to distance themselves as far from Trump as possible.

The once two-party competitive Jefferson County voted nearly 65 percent for the Democratic gubernatorial candidate. This was the year of aroused independents, women, and suburbanites. Voters seemed less inspired by the candidates than they were about sending a message of disapproval to President Trump.

We want to call attention to a less understood part of Colorado's political culture. It is not a defining factor such as Trump was this year, yet it is part of the foundational philosophical leanings of our state.

Colorado has a small third political party – the Libertarian Party. They nominate candidates for many offices yet rarely win. There are, in fact, just a

handful of elected Libertarians in office in Colorado – in places such as Lakewood, Milliken, Frederick, and in San Miguel County.

But there is more to the Libertarian Party, or at least the libertarian spirit, than easily meets the eye.

Libertarianism is a set of political principles that celebrate personal liberty, emphasize freedom of choice, voluntary associations, individual judgement, and limited government. Libertarian theories can be traced back to ancient Chinese philosophers and French anarchists.

The Libertarian Party in the United States was founded in December of 1971 in Colorado Springs. It was inspired in part by libertarian-leaning economists Ludwig von Mises and Frederick Hayek. The novelist Ayn Rand (1905-1982), who wrote the best-selling novels *Atlas Shrugged* and *The Fountainhead*, is viewed as a godmother of the libertarian movement. Note that her fictional boot camp for her heroic would-be libertarian revolutionaries, including James John Galt, was based in a Colorado mountain region. This might have been inspired by Rand vacationing in the rugged individualistic hamlet of Ouray.

Turns out that Governor-elect Jared Polis is proud of several libertarian-leaning positions he has taken over the years. He boasts of his membership in the small libertarian caucus in the U.S. House of Representatives. Some commentators have described him as one of the most libertarian-leaning Democrats in Congress, and Polis has defined himself as "left-libertarian-ish."

How does Polis earn these descriptions? He has favored constitutional amendments that would balance the federal budget, which is a contrarian position in the Democratic Party. He, in common with Ron and Rand Paul, has opposed U.S military actions in Iraq and Afghanistan. He favors the decriminalization of marijuana. He is an outspoken champion of civil liberties and gay rights. He is not only an advocate but has started and operated charter schools.

Polis also stated that he favors a modest reduction in Colorado's state income tax. Turns out, as well, that Polis is a long-time friend of Arthur Laffer, a well-known "trickle-down" economic theorist.

Polis understands that Colorado voters dislike voting to increase state taxes. He did not support the recent ballot issues that would have increased state taxes for education and roads and highways. He also opposed, to the consternation of environmentalists, Prop 112, which would have imposed greater set-backs for drilling and fracking operations in Colorado.

No one believes Jared Polis is going to shrink Colorado's state government. Indeed his campaign narratives were mainly about pushing programs for all-day kindergarten, providing more public pre-schooling, and major expansions in health care access.

What is confusing is that most of us typically think of libertarians as holding positions to the right of conservative Republicans. But we contend just about all of us – across the political spectrum – love our personal freedom and are skeptical about big government and are wary of the regulatory state.

The point is that you do not have to be a Republican or a conservative to share a number of libertarian aspirations. Many unaffiliated voters and Democratic partisans share the "Don't Fence Me In" philosophy and strongly support America's entrepreneurial free-market economic system. Most of us have a Thoreau inspired distaste for governments that tax us to finance programs we do not support.

John Hickenlooper won elections and was popular in Colorado because he was a pro-growth, pro-business Chamber of Commerce Democrat. But he leaves office with an education system that needs more investment and a highway system that similarly needs more financial attention.

What kind of governor will Polis be? He certainly campaigned as a bold programmatic progressive. Yet it is clear he has a libertarian streak in him that will be skeptical of big, bold and expensive government programs.

Colorado is a paradoxical state. On the one hand we are proud of our state and we want it to succeed. Its current economy has certainly been successful. On the other hand, we like being a low-tax state and, thanks to TABOR requirements for voting on all tax increases, we seldom vote to support the tax hikes required to provide good public schools and a sound state highway system.

That is what just happened in the 2018 mid-term elections. A majority of those crucial unaffiliated voters who cast votes for Polis and the entire Blue Team apparently just as enthusiastically voted down the ballot issues on education and highway spending.

Do we have a paradoxical new governor to match our state's paradoxical political leanings? Our prediction is that he will be more of a Democrat than a libertarian, but do not be surprised if he mixes the two philosophies up a bit.

So the Libertarian Party did not win much in terms of political offices in Colorado in 2018. Still, two major statewide tax hikes were voted down. So also were stricter regulations on Colorado's energy industry. Voters have a new governor who has pledged state income tax reductions and accepts the TABOR constitutional principle that any state tax increases can only be approved by the voters.

That is at least something for libertarians to cheer about – and perhaps even to pass around a glass or two of champagne.

Being libertarians, of course, each will have to pay for her or his own glass of champagne.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
12-2-2018

A RUNDOWN OF AMERICA'S GREATEST POLITICAL STORYTELLERS

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Political novelists are our nation's storytellers. They tackle the big questions inherent in the idea of America. They bring to life the tragedies of our history – slavery, Manifest Destiny, the Great Depression, "America First" isolationism, political corruption, political paranoia, as well as our exalted faith in liberty and freedom.

Yet underlying these stories is a certain idealism – or optimism – about the American political experiment. The hope is that we can work together to achieve our aspirational goals. These political novelists, in many ways, are seekers and defenders of the American soul.

Here are ten political novels that offer invaluable insight into who we are, where we have come from, and who we might yet become. They are listed in historical order. They would make excellent Christmas gifts:

1. Harriet Beecher Stowe, *UNCLE TOM'S CABIN* (1852) - This novel portrayed the injustices of human slavery in the United States prior to the Civil War. It is regarded as the most consequential novel in American history. Stowe, more than any other individual, helped to advance the Emancipation Proclamation during the Civil War and the Thirteenth Amendment freeing the slaves.

She wrote to rally America to transcend racism and to treat everyone as human beings. She was intentionally preachy because she understood this was needed to shame her fence-sitting Christian friends, and a reluctant Abraham Lincoln, into exercising moral responsibility on the slavery issue.

2. Henry Adams, *DEMOCRACY: AN AMERICAN NOVEL* (1880) - Adams was the privileged and erudite son, grandson and great grandson of American statesmen. He lived off and on in Washington, D.C., and often did not like what he was seeing. His caustic novel, published anonymously, warned that the American political experiment was hemorrhaging from integrity-deficit disorder.

Adams has his fictional characters look closely at our presidential-congressional separation of powers system. They found hypocrisy, bribery and partisanship over principle. Adams, through his characters, calls for a Civil Service Reform Act and for better leaders who have moral fiber.

3. Helen Hunt Jackson: *RAMONA* (1884) - Colorado Springs resident Helen Hunt Jackson tried to do for Native-Americans what Stowe had done for African-American slaves. *Ramona* is a heart-wrenching novel that reminds us of the darker aspects of Manifest Destiny. It remains a classic consciousness-raiser, and it triggered some needed legislative reforms. It deserves to be reread in this new period of concern for Native-Americans.

4. John Steinbeck, *GRAPES OF WRATH* (1939) - This is a hard hitting expose of greed, meanness and the imperfections of our economic practices. Steinbeck said he wrote this "purpose novel" to shame the "greedy bastards who were responsible." He added: "I've done my damndest to rip the readers' nerves to rags."

Grapes of Wrath chronicles the Joad family as they search for grapes, jobs, fair pay, and humanity during the darkest days of the Great Depression. Eleanor Roosevelt rejected criticism that the book was un-American. It was, she insisted, "a profoundly religious, spiritual, and ethically urgent book." Millions of readers have agreed.

5. Robert Penn Warren, *ALL THE KING'S MEN* (1946) - Warren's classic is the essential American political novel. It tells the story of a populist rural politician who mobilizes his fellow "hicks" to take on the corrupt politicos who run their fictional southern state. Protagonist Willie Stark wins an upset victory and becomes an activist governor, championing

much needed redistributive policies. Stark, after some success, becomes intoxicated with fame and power and begins to confuse "needership" with leadership.

This novel also tells the dispiriting story of Stark's right-hand man, Jack Burden. He is a well-educated son of privilege who gets sucked into Stark's ambitions to make himself and his state great. Burden is painfully slow to understand his moral responsibilities, as well as this nation's constitutional principles.

6. Richard Condon, *THE MANCHURIAN CANDIDATE* (1959) - Condon's convoluted satirical, psychological, and political thriller gives a range of narratives, including soldier brain-washing and dodgy presidential politics. A power-driven Joe McCarthy-style U.S. senator secretly uses help from a foreign power to try to win the U.S. presidency. Sound familiar? The central theme is to beware paranoid ideologues who attempt to undermine our nation's constitutional practices.

7. Allen Drury, *ADVISE AND CONSENT* (1959) – This is the best novel on Congress. Drury's bestselling melodrama captures the U.S. senate at work as it processes a controversial presidential nomination for secretary of state. Drury's fictionalized nation's capital has its share of vain, pompous and self-serving officials in all three branches. Yet it wonderfully portrays, in very human ways, compassionate, hardworking and conscientious senators dedicated to representative government, thoughtful deliberation, and doing the right thing.

8. Fletcher Knebel and Charles Bailey, *SEVEN DAYS IN MAY* (1962) -
Two veteran Washington journalists gave us a powerfully instructive political thriller that warns against the type of military coup that has regularly happened in dozens of countries around the world. Generals and admirals perform in a fictional Pentagon plot to overthrow an unpopular president. As the fictional president muses at the end of the novel: "With missiles and satellites and nuclear weapons, military commanders could take control of the nation by just pushing some buttons."

9. Michael Shaara, *THE KILLER ANGELS* (1975)

Shaara gave us one of the most readable and illuminating novels of wartime leadership in America. He describes how Union and Confederate military commanders made battlefield judgments at the crucial showdown in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, in the Civil War. Shaara carefully studied all the records and diaries yet had to imagine the conversations between Confederate General Robert E. Lee and his deputies and their counterparts on the Union side.

A Union officer explains that while other men and other nations have gone to war for loot or new territory, the Union Army fights for something more noble. "This is free ground," the Union officer tells his troops. "All the way from here to the Pacific Ocean. No man has to bow. No man born to royalty. Here we judge you by what you do, not by what your father was … It is the idea that we all have value." Chamberlain's soldiers responded and helped to defeat Lee's troops at Gettysburg.

10. Toni Morrison, *BELOVED* (1987)

Morrison's remarkable narrative is not just about what protagonist Sethe Garner wants to remember and forget. It is about what America needs to remember about the unspeakable "unspoken" that happened in the Middle Passage, the slave trade across the Atlantic. Hers is the story of a nation that made dreadfully bad choices and repeatedly lost its moral compass.

Morrison's storytelling is exhilarating, lyrical, and packed with magical realism and biblical symbolism. She believed the best art is "political and irrevocably beautiful at the same time."

As the idea of America and its soul are much debated these days, these and dozens of other great American novels should be read or reread.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy have both taught college classes on the American political novel. Tom Cronin's "Imagining a Great Republic" (*Rowman & Littlefield*, 2018) *provides an extensive discussion of three dozen important American political novels.*

Colorado Springs Gazette
12-9-2018

BOLD VISION RE-IMAGINES NEVADA AVENUE

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Nevada Avenue is a ten-and-a-half mile north-south boulevard that courses through Colorado Springs. It begins a bit north of the now sprawling University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS) and goes south to wind-up at S. Academy Boulevard, near Fort Carson and Pikes Peak Community College (PPCC).

Similar to most north-south streets in the older part of Colorado Springs, it is named after a mountain range, the snow-capped Sierra Nevada. East-West streets are named for rivers (Platte Ave., etc.).

PlanCOS, the latest version of the Colorado Springs comprehensive plan, has a bold vision for Nevada Avenue. Parts of this lengthy street, under the new plan, will be transformed into a super street – a six-lane "multimodal corridor" with frequent transit service (on its own right of way) as well as conventional automobile traffic, walking, and bicycling.

And there is more. The northern portion of the Nevada Avenue corridor, from downtown north to the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS), will also be designated a "creative corridor," where art and culture will be emphasized along with economic development.

It is pleasing to note there already are a dozen or so sculptures alongside the University Village shopping center and around the majestic new Ent Center for the Arts at UCCS.

PlanCOS has already been reviewed by the City Planning Commission. It will undergo public hearings and probable adoption by the City Council in early January. Copies of the draft plan are available on the internet.

This planned new high-density, high-activity corridor will be long, stretching "from UCCS to South Academy Boulevard (Ch. 5, p. 8)." Along the way it passes through such activity centers as Penrose Hospital, Colorado College, Palmer High School, City Hall, the Pioneers Museum, and downtown.

Nevada Avenue, where it makes sense, will be widened. At its widest point it will include a landscaped sidewalk, a bike lane, two lanes of automobile traffic northbound, a large landscaped median (similar to the medians already in Nevada Avenue), two lanes of auto traffic southbound, a second bike lane, a second landscaped sidewalk, two lanes of Bus Rapid Transit (one lane in each direction), and then a landscaped biker-hiker trail (drawing at 5, 8; map at 5, 11).

In short, Nevada Avenue, which is already a bustling boulevard, will be turned into what PlanCOS calls a "complete street." A complete street does not just serve the private automobile but is "built for safe and convenient travel by all road users, including people on foot and bicycle, as well as transit users (5, 16)."

This expansion of Nevada Avenue will not take place downtown or through the Old North End or the Near North End. Other methods of accommodating the buses and bikes and pedestrians will be needed in those older parts of the city. But the six-lane approach could very well work at the north and south ends of Nevada Avenue where the street is more open with room to expand.

As for the more built-up parts of Nevada, PlanCOS suggests a "multistreet" approach with the autos, buses, bikes, and pedestrians taking different streets to get where they need to go, thus lightening the burden on any one street. The plan specifically calls for "mitigating the impacts of multi-modal transportation … on traditional, historic, and established neighborhoods (5, 18)."

PlanCOS makes clear that an "effective transit service" is a key component of the bold new Nevada Avenue. Buses will run on their own separate rights of way rather than through traffic, thereby avoiding traffic

tie-ups and providing fast and frequent service. The planners call for flexibility here, with a historic street car line or passenger rail as a possible alternative to buses.

The point is, that as the density and activity increase along the various parts of Nevada Avenue, people can travel quickly and easily from one activity point to another by public transit, thus discouraging the use of the private automobile. If the buses succeed at driving down the automobile traffic, living or working on Nevada Avenue could become a more pleasant proposition.

The creative corridor planned for Nevada Avenue would build on the arts and culture already thriving in the area, starting with the Ent Center for the Arts at UCCS. Moving south from UCCS down Nevada Avenue, the creative corridor takes a jog at Uintah Street and then goes down Cascade Avenue to downtown, thus taking it right past the Fine Arts Center and the Gaylord Performing Arts Center at Colorado College. It then will pass the Pikes Peak Center downtown (map, 6, 9). Also along the way will be the planned new hockey rink at Colorado College – the Ed Robson Events Center at Nevada and Dale St.

In the future,, PlanCOS calls for particularly emphasizing arts and culture at Fillmore Street and Nevada Avenue as well as in the downtown area.

Nevada Avenue is just one Colorado Springs street proposed for this multimodal approach. Constitution Avenue, Woodmen Road, and Colorado Avenue are also candidates for the super street treatment (5, 8).

There will be critics of these plans for Nevada Avenue. Some people will dispute the need for any of these planned "upgrades" and "improvements." Some will warn it all means greater taxation and regulation, both of which are loaded words in Colorado Springs. Still others will complain because they do not support public transportation and bike lanes.

A few of these complaints are valid. But planners have to think a generation or two into the future. They also know that several of these

projects will be done by private developers or through the creation of public-private partnerships. And in certain cases there will be U.S. Government dollars that can be requested to achieve some of these goals, particularly for mass transit. PlanCOS is laying out the options.

In any event, let the conversation about the future plan for Colorado Springs begin.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College. Bob Loevy served on the City Planning Commission from 1972-1975.

Colorado Springs Gazette
12-6-2018

AND NOW, THE BIG EVENT: POLIS VS. THE CONSTITUTION

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Jared Polis defeated a handful of Democratic competitors for governor of Colorado in the primary last June. He handily beat his Republican opponent in the general election this past November, carrying Democratic majorities in both houses of the state legislature into office with him. But Governor-elect Polis's biggest battle may still lie ahead of him – the battle to cope with the strict limits on Colorado finances embedded in the state constitution.

The financial restrictions in the Colorado constitution are rigid. They are mainly found in TABOR, the Taxpayers' Bill of Rights, which was put into the state constitution in 1992 by a vote of the people. It requires a vote on all tax increases and increases in public debt. There are other provisions in the state constitution that submit any state and local borrowing to a public vote.

Similar to his predecessors in the Capitol's first-floor Governor's Office, if Jared Polis wants to have a real impact on solving problems in Colorado, he will have to "lead the voters" into voting for selective tax increases and for major loans. If Polis does not do this, the state's highways will continue to decay, K-12 education will be underfinanced, health care for low-income Coloradans will be progressively inadequate, and tuition at the state's public colleges and universities will continue to go up. And we will not have all-day kindergarten, which was one of Polis's campaign pledges.

Let's take a look at the three men who were governor of Colorado prior to Jared Polis being elected. How did they handle the twin problems of

a vote on all tax increases and a voter OK for borrowing money? What can we – and Governor-elect Polis – learn from their examples?

Bill Owens, Republican, was governor from 1989 to 2007. Finding the state's highways in woeful condition, he set about winning voter approval for $1.7 billion for 28 road improvement projects scattered throughout the state. Owens campaigned hard, urging voters to approve his and the legislature's ideas on state road improvements. The highlight of the program was the legendary T-REX, which widened I-25 south of Denver to more than eight lanes in places. I-25 through Colorado Springs was upgraded to six lanes. T-REX earned Owens the nickname of "Ten-Lane Bill," at least from some of his friends.

Governor Owens then turned his attention to TABOR and its limiting effects on state revenues. Joining with state Democratic leaders, Owens promoted Referendum C, a five-year "timeout" from the crippling effects of TABOR on state finances. Once again Owens threw himself into the campaign, touting its bi-partisan support. Referendum C was narrowly approved by the voters, showing that using the "bully pulpit" of the governorship to get voter support for needed state programs could work.

The Owens model was courageous and successful. Our incoming governor should similarly take the lead in creating major programs for the state and then have the legislature bring them to the voters for approval.

Bill Ritter, Democrat, succeeded Owens as governor in 2007. He made a major effort to promote alternative forms of energy in Colorado, particularly wind and solar. He was very popular with environmentalists.

Governor Ritter tried to follow in Bill Owens's footsteps. He developed and took to the voters an ambitious plan to raise money for scholarships at state colleges and universities by reducing tax breaks for the state's oil and gas producers. Ritter campaigned hard, but the oil and gas industry raised big money to oppose Ritter's scholarship plan and ran TV ads attacking Ritter personally.

The scholarship plan was voted down in 2008, the same year that a major economic recession had hit the United States and Colorado. The

recession forced Ritter to start cutting the state budget rather than expanding it. Ritter ended his governorship after only four years, declining to run for re-election in 2010.

The Ritter model is a cautionary tale. Go to the voters to finance needed state improvement projects, yet make sure your plan has the support of the leadership of consequential business stakeholders.

That brings us to our retiring governor – Democrat **John Hickenlooper**. He has served two terms as governor, starting in 2011, and is term-limited to eight years in office. He will be replaced by Jared Polis in January.

Hickenlooper was forced to continue cutting the state budget, as Ritter had done, in the early years of his governorship. As the economy improved and state revenues weakly recovered, Hickenlooper was freed from the extreme budget pressures that characterized his early years in office. His careful budgeting earned him favorable approval ratings in public opinion polls. He has been particularly popular with the business community.

But unlike Owens and Ritter, Hickenlooper has been shy about going to the voters for major infusions of cash from tax increases and large loans. When the subject came up, Hickenlooper more than once said words to the effect that "Colorado is not ready for a tax increase at this time." One result of this has been that, without new money for major road improvements, the state transportation department (CDOT) has turned to improving highways by installing toll lanes financed by private investors. Another result is some cash-starved school districts have been forced to adopt a four-day week.

The Hickenlooper model is to accept the reality that Coloradans do not like tax increases or borrowing money and want to make do with current revenues, no matter how meager some might consider those revenues.

Governor-elect Polis has already recruited experienced state policy and financial experts in Wade Buchanan and Cary Kennedy. We trust that Polis, his advisory team, and legislative leaders will learn from the Owens model and, when appropriate, lead the voters into approving the moneys needed to improve state government in Colorado. The Ritter model gives us

pause, however, because success in not guaranteed under the Owens model. It will be disappointing if we just maintain the status quo. But we acknowledge that is the safest most conservative choice.

A big "if" will be the state of the economy. Owens and Hickenlooper presided in generally prosperous economic times. Ritter did not have that good fortune.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
12-23-2018

"TO KILL A MOCKINGBIRD" MAKES TIMELY BROADWAY DEBUT

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

There is a new hit on Broadway yet it is not a musical like *Hamilton* or *The Lion King*. It is serious theatre about prejudice, racial inequality, and the aspirational ideals of the American republic, such as "the rule of law."

Pulitzer Prize-winner Harper Lee, before she died in 2016, agreed to sell the rights to her novel *To Kill a Mockingbird* (1960) to producers who hired screenwriter Aaron Sorkin, well known for his *The West Wing* television show as well as *Money Ball* and *Social Network*.

The play opened recently at New York City's Sam Shubert Theater on West 44th street to rave reviews. It will probably have a long run in good part because the parable of Scout, Jem and Atticus Finch in fictionalized Maycomb, Alabama, is a cherished and widely read story. The novel has sold nearly 50 million copies and is read by most 10th graders in American Literature. The Oscar-winning film (1962), starring Gregory Peck, remains a well-watched classic.

This play will encourage many people to reread this novel as one of us did this week. *Mockingbird* and Sorkin's revised version will remain timely as long as bigotry and injustice persist.

In Atticus Finch, Harper Lee gave us one of the finest fathers and most memorable public defenders in American Literature. Lee's fictionalized dad, a lot like her own dad, was a 50-year-old widower who practiced law and represented his county in the Alabama state legislature. Finch is a man of decency and a local icon of civic and stoic rectitude. Most people, he instructs his son and daughter, are nice people, especially when

you come to know them. Yet you never really understand a person, he says, until you make the effort to consider things from their point of view.

He was Mr. Rogers before there was a Mr. Rogers.

The challenge in this fictional memoir of a small racially segregated rural community in 1935 is that racial prejudice is pronounced. It is set two decades before the Supreme Court case *Brown v. Board of Education* will prohibit segregation in our public schools.

Lee's *Mockingbird* Finch is not a civil rights activist, but he had studied the law and was a member in good standing of the local and state bar associations. He wanted to believe that everyone would be treated equally in our law courts. And he embraced our republic's belief in the rule of law.

The local circuit court judge jolts Finch by asking him to serve as the public defender for a 25-year-old black field hand named Tom Robinson, who has been falsely accused of raping a 19-year-old lower income white woman. She is the daughter of the town drunk.

Finch had hoped his law practice would not have to be involved in this type of case, but, in the event, he accepts.

That case becomes the famous trial in the Maycomb County Courthouse. The court trial is the centerpiece of the Broadway play yet is less than a third of Lee's celebrated novel.

It is a sad story. Finch and his family are vilified and almost lose their lives merely because he accepts the unwanted assignment of providing counsel for a black defendant. Moreover, a gang of townspeople are barely prevented, by Finch and his daughter Scout, from seizing the defendant from the local jail and lynching him on the night before the trial.

Finch is no super lawyer. He is essentially a home-schooled lawyer. But he does a pretty good job (though a few legal scholars have argued he could have done a better job) of making a strong case for Tom Robinson. However, a jury of twelve white males (in a county that is about half black and half white) accepts circumstantial evidence, finds Tom Robinson guilty beyond any reasonable doubt, and sentences him to be hanged. He is sent to

a state prison where Tom Robinson attempts to escape from prison and is shot to death by one of the guards.

Lee's novel is compelling. Finch's daughter narrates the events taking place in her town over a three or four year period. It is a lyrical and sometimes poetic coming of age story of an innocent and curious tomboy being introduced to the harsh realities of the Jim Crow South.

Finch could have rejected the case and left it to the rookie lawyers who usually get the job. But he felt it was a matter of conscience. He could not go to church and worship God if "he didn't try to help that man." The heart of the novel is that, even in losing his case, Atticus Finch teaches us about what equality of the law should mean and the type of country we might yet become.

He understood that his client was already doomed by public sentiment in this Caucasian county court, yet he also believed that "the one thing that doesn't abide by majority rule is a person's conscience."

Finch also believed everyone ought to get a square deal even though he is "any color of the rainbow." In one of his most quoted lines, Finch remarked: "There is one human institution that makes a pauper the equal of a Rockefeller, the stupid man the equal of an Einstein, the ignorant man the equal of a college president." That institution, Finch declared, is a court.

He articulated America's aspirational ideals, yet he was also aware that "people have a way of carrying their resentments right into the jury box." And that was what happened.

Lee gives us at least a few upbeat takeaways in *To Kill a Mockingbird*. First, Finch's daughter is told by others that the fact that Atticus was selected to serve as Robinson's public defender meant the judge believed that the highly respected Finch might be the only lawyer around who could see justice served in this case.

A second good thing, at least relatively, was that Scout and her father used reason to dissuade the local mob from lynching Tom Robinson.

A third is that Atticus's defense caused the jury to stay out and deliberate for a few hours before rendering their verdict of guilty. Routinely

a black accused of committing a crime against a white person at that time and place would have been found guilty after only a few minutes of deliberation.

Lee's largest gift with this book was that it was an instructive parable. We cannot love America until we just understand and love our neighbors. And, though Lee did not develop this much, we need to work to reduce both black and white inequality that breeds resentments and prejudice.

The new Broadway play had to deal with three major challenges:

First, Lee's *Mockingbird* novel gave us a white male attorney as the hero protagonist while portraying African-Americans as voiceless and incapable of acting for themselves. Moreover, the black community, although barely discussed, treats Finch as a savior figure. Sorkin, along with most of us, felt all this was rather dated, even if historically the case. Sorkin's stage adaptation tries to give a little agency to his black actors. We'll have to see how this "plays" out.

Sorkin, who was legally bound not to stray much from the spirit of the original novel, also raises some skepticism about Finch's unrealistic optimism that there is goodness in everyone, or as some might put that: "There are good people on both sides." Finch confuses American idealism and his town's racist realities when he fantasizes that "in this country our courts are the great levelers, and in our courts all persons are created equal."

Second, our fictionalized Finch in *Mockingbird* seems to overlook or rationalize the existence of white supremacist Ku Klux Klan activists and Klan sympathizers. Harper Lee's second novel, *Go Set a Watchman* (2015), exposes her hometown and virtually unmasks her father as a committed segregationist. This second book, although written about the same time as *Mockingbird*, is set a generation or so later when Finch is in his 70s. He and his courthouse buddies are now fighting the U.S. Government over the 1954 *Brown* decision, trying to get rid of agitating NAACP attorneys and trying to protect their segregationist traditions. Atticus is now a leader of the local White Citizen's Council.

If *Mockingbird's* Finch was too good and decent to be believable, *Watchman's* Finch is disconcertingly and disappointingly too human. A now older Scout Finch calls her father out as a hypocrite and racist: "I looked up to you, Atticus, like I never looked up to anybody in my life and never will again."

Watchman is the more politically instructive book about Lee's home county, its politics and its political culture. Yet in it she shrinks if not disowns the once saintly Atticus. Sorkin's play treats only the Atticus in Lee's first novel, but we are understandably haunted by Lee's later "disrobing" of Maycomb's marble man.

Atticus Finch lives again in this new play. While watching it, Americans will inevitably ask themselves how we can better achieve our goals of the rule of law and equal justice under the law.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.

Colorado Springs Gazette
12-24-2018

A LAST LOOK AT COLORADO'S 2018 NOVEMBER ELECTIONS

By Thomas E. Cronin and Robert D. Loevy

Official results for Colorado's 2018 midterm elections are now posted on the internet site of the secretary of state's office. More than 2.5 million Coloradans voted in the November 6th election. We had one of the highest voter turnouts in the nation. This was aided by our making it easy to vote, and there were a handful of hotly-debated issues on the ballot. So this is a good time to take one last look at the patterns and probable forces at work.

Colorado voters have a history of electing statewide officials from both the major political parties – often electing a Democrat or two along with a Republican or two on the same day. Thus in 2014 Coloradans elected both Democratic Governor John Hickenlooper and Republican U.S. Senator Cory Gardner. In the 1970s and 1980s we regularly elected Democratic governors along with Republican secretaries of state.

Election 2018 was different. Colorado voters, with the exception of three gerrymandered Republican congressional districts, voted consistently, within about a percentage point or so, for the four Democrats running for major statewide positions. Thus Democratic Governor-elect Jared Polis won 53.4 percent of the total votes cast; Democratic Secretary of State-elect Jena Griswold won 52.7 percent; Democratic Treasurer-elect Dave Young won 52.2 percent; and Democratic Attorney General-elect Phil Weiser won 51.6 percent.

Their Republican opponents trailed anywhere from 6 to 10 points behind. Walker Stapleton received 42.8 percent of the total vote for governor. Republican secretary of state candidate Wayne Williams polled

44.7 percent; GOP treasurer candidate Brian Watson got 44.9 percent; and Republican attorney general hopeful George Brauchler took 45.1 percent.

That looks a lot like, several commentators noted, straight party line voting. Registered Democrats, however, probably comprised only 32 or 33 percent of the vote. Most of the rest of the support for the Democratic candidates came from unaffiliated voters. About three percent or so of those voting were voting for a third party candidate, such as a Libertarian, American Constitution, or a Unity Party member.

It is highly likely that about 92 or 93 percent of registered Democrats voted for the four Democratic candidates for major statewide offices. Similarly, 90 percent or more of registered Republican voters likely voted for Republican candidates.

Unaffiliated voters, often called independents, made up at least a third of those voting – and it is clear that majorities of these voters veered over to the Democrats, especially, as we will note, in the Denver metropolitan area.

Also significant is that there was an open statewide position on the ballot for the CU Board of Regents. These candidates were even less well known than the other statewide candidates. Democrat Lesley Smith won this election by essentially the same percentage of the vote (52.0) as Democrats won in the governor's race and the other statewide elections. The Republican candidate, Ken Montera, was at 43.0 percent, strikingly similar to the other Republicans running statewide.

Candidate quality, experience, and character seemed to play a secondary role to partisan preferences in the 2018 midterm elections in Colorado. There were qualified Republican candidates. Incumbent Secretary of State Wayne Williams had won national plaudits for the efficiency and transparency of Colorado's election procedures and for Colorado's widely acknowledged high voter registration and high voter turnout. But that did not seem to matter. Democrat Jena Griswold, who had never held elected office, easily defeated Republican Williams.

We believe three factors, two small ones and one large one, help explain the nearly six to ten percent advantage Democrats had in the 2018 Colorado midterm election results.

First, the term-limited outgoing governor, John Hickenlooper, had a very positive record on the economy. Republicans could not mount a serious charge that the Hickenlooper administration had failed to produce prosperity and good economic times.

Second, Jared Polis had better name recognition than his Republican opponent (Walker Stapleton) and had the personal wealth to add to and embellish his name recognition and his advocacy for education and health care. He had sixteen years serving in public office at the state level compared to only eight years for Republican Stapleton (as state treasurer). That Polis only ran a percentage point or two ahead of the other Democrats is a bit surprising because, compared to Polis, the other Democrats ran comparatively low budget campaigns.

By far the biggest factor in the race was that a large number of Coloradans, rightly or wrongly, viewed their votes as a way of sending a message to President Trump. And not unlike Secretary of Defense James Mattis's recent letter of resignation, the message was one of rebuke and dissent on issues such as immigration, health care, tariffs, strategic foreign alliances, and how Trump has treated the Department of Justice.

Trump was the elephant, and in this case, the rogue elephant, in the room.

So the anticipated "blue wave" of Democratic victories occasioned by Trump's unpopularity hit Colorado hard and seemed to make candidate quality or character marginal to the election outcome. It was a tough day for the Republicans. In Brauchler and Williams, the GOP may have lost two of its stronger future candidates for such statewide offices as governor and U.S. Senator. A political comeback will be difficult for them.

Another take-away from the 2018 midterm elections is the extent to which the Democrats are solidifying their control in the close-in Denver suburbs, a populous part of the state that use to be a swing area between the

two parties yet went strongly for Democratic gubernatorial candidate Jared Polis.

Jefferson County, the western suburbs of the Denver metropolitan area, went 54.4 percent for Democrat Polis and only 41.5 percent for Republican Stapleton, a spread of 12.9 points. Arapahoe County, the southern and southeastern suburbs of Denver, gave Polis 57.2 percent and Stapleton only 39.4 percent, a Democratic lead of 17.8 points. Adams County, the northern and northeastern suburbs of Denver Metro, favored Polis by 54.6 to Stapleton's 40.6, a 14 point spread.

If the Republicans want to return to winning statewide elections in Colorado, they are going to have to craft policies and recruit candidates that can appeal to independent voters in these three populous Denver suburban counties. And there is trouble for the Republicans brewing to the north in Larimer County (county seat, Fort Collins). That previously swing county checked in at 54.8 percent for Polis and 41.8 for Stapleton, a 13 point advantage for the Democrats.

Tom Cronin and Bob Loevy are political scientists at Colorado College.